CANADIAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY
A Quarterly of Christian Thought

Vol. II, No. 3 July, 1956

EDITORIALS

A Theological Need 125

The Historic Life of Jesus 126

ARTICLES

The Meaning of Baptism — T. F. Torrance 129

The Expression "Word of God" in Scripture — David W. Hay 135

Preaching the Gospel Today — W. Morrison Kelly 143

Canadian Universities and the Teaching of Religion — John W. Wevers 151

Harnack Revised — E. L. Allen 163

BOOK REVIEWS

The Dead Sea Scrolls — T. A. M. Barnett 171

Derrick Sherwin Bailey: *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition* — Charles Feilding 176

Steven Runciman: *The Medieval Manichee* — John Gordon Rowe 178

Charles W. Kegley and Robert W. Bretall (editors): *Reinhold Niebuhr* — Charles C. Landon 180

William E. Mann: Sect, Cult and Church in Alberta — H. H. Walsh 182

Giovani Miegge: *The Virgin Mary* — W. Lyndon Smith 184

THE REV. T. F. TORRANCE, M.B.E., D.D., D.THEOL., is Professor of Divinity at New College, Edinburgh, and is one of the Editors of the *Scottish Journal of Theology.*

THE REV. DAVID W. HAY, M.A., D.D., is Professor of Systematic Theology at Knox College, Toronto.

THE REV. W. MORRISON KELLY, S.T.M., until recently Minister of St. Andrew's United Church, Toronto, has been appointed as Old St. Andrew's Professor of Public Worship at Emmanuel College.

THE REV. E. L. ALLEN, M.A., PH.D., D.D., is Head of the Department of Divinity at King's College, Newcastle upon Tyne.

THE REV. JOHN W. WEVERS, B.D., TH.D., is Assistant Professor of Oriental Languages at University College, University of Toronto.

---

WE INVITE CONTRIBUTIONS, which should be addressed to the Secretary of the Editorial Committee. MSS should be typewritten, double spaced, and proof-read before being submitted. Notes should be gathered at the end of articles, with appropriate references. No MS will be returned unless accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope.

BOOKS FOR REVIEW should be sent to The Rev. John W. Wevers, University College, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario.

THE JOURNAL is recognized as a charitable organization for Canadian income tax purposes. Financial contributions, other than the amount paid for subscription, may be deducted from the donor's income, when calculating tax. Donations are urgently needed if the price of the JOURNAL is to be kept within the means of all subscribers.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND BUSINESS CORRESPONDENCE should be sent to the Secretary of the Board of Directors, Wycliffe College, Toronto 5. Cheques should be made out to the Canadian Journal of Theology, Incorporated, payable at par in Toronto.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

| *Regular* | *Students* |
|---|---|
| One Year $3.00 | One Year $1.50 |
| Two Years $5.00 | Two Years $3.00 |

Single issues $1.00

# Editorials

## A THEOLOGICAL NEED

ONE of the most disturbing developments of our time is the abandonment, by the individual, of moral responsibility. By this is not meant that the ordinary man refuses to accept responsibility for his personal actions but that the realm of personal action has become so limited that individuals accept tremendous changes in the moral atmosphere of the world with apathy. When, some time ago, a man murdered his mother, the shock the act caused was not on account of the matricide so much as that, in order to accomplish his end, the murderer introduced a time bomb into the plane on which his mother was travelling, completely destroying the machine and some forty other people. The fact is, however, that he was simply using for his own greed a pattern of life which has become normal in the modern world—travel by air. When that pattern is made the instrument of mass destruction we are stirred into alarm. This is an indication of our condition.

Our situation has arisen because we have largely lost our theological concern for life. So many of the recent developments in knowledge and affairs have taken place among immediate political and national pressures that we are involved in tragedy as a modus vivendi. The struggle for survival in World War II removed the theological content from such words as freedom, justice and humanity, while uniting in uneasy equilibrium powers whose interpretation of those words were vastly different. The threat of destruction removed, the development of knowledge, and material and natural resources have been employed in the ideological struggle between those who were once allies. All this has been accepted as inevitable and the contemporary problems of atomic warfare, the supply of arms, food and economic help to smaller nations and the meaning of international responsibility become political questions to which we are related only by vague apprehension. The internal problems of an industrial civilisation become matters of adjustment of power and even education is dominated by the demands of a scientific age in search of security. The patterns of our life are dangerous and can lead to destruction.

We cannot, if we would, return to an uncomplicated existence. No one would suggest a return to horse and buggy days because an air-liner can be destroyed by a self-centred individual. But the reality of our personal involvement needs to be much more clearly appreciated, even if the realm of our personal action is narrowly limited. It is necessary, if elementary, to remind ourselves that people are the ultimate terms in problems of human relations, that the moral consciousness of people is the real authority behind governmental action, an authority which no government dare outrage but which, through ignorance or indifference, can lose its rightful power. The

Church exists to arouse this moral consciousness so that justice, freedom, security and fulfilment are terms of wider than national or hemispherical meaning because they are rooted in the Gospel. The indictment against us is that international policy rarely, if ever, has to justify itself to us on moral grounds but only on grounds of military and national security. Canadian ebullience in anticipating an increasing significance in world affairs due to the development of tremendous natural resources makes us peculiarly vulnerable to a lapse of moral consciousness.

What we need is the recognition that all problems are ultimately theological. Whatever the limitations on our direct action, ignorance of the issues involved is culpable. It is the task of the Church, in preaching and writing, to pick out present and recognisable problems in various areas of human relations and to subject them to a searching criticism in the light of the Gospel, enlightening us both as to their inevitability as well as to their true, human meaning. The fatalistic indifference of ordinary folk in regard to a future in which they see little hope but from which they expect no escape is moral defeat. If there is to be any significant conversation between the Christian hope and the paranoia of the world it must be upon the background of an informed conscience. We can expect no sudden and magical solution for our condition but, in the realm where some meaningful personal choice remains, that of vocation, we can bring back the responsibility of real choice.

J. G. C.

## THE HISTORIC LIFE OF JESUS

THE difficulties of writing a "life" of Jesus are well known. That the New Testament Gospels are not biographies is a commonplace of modern scholarship. Form critics assume that the traditional knowledge of Jesus and of what he said was preserved in the primitive Church in isolated units; and they warn us that as it now appears in the Gospels it is coloured and formed by the doctrinal opinions of the primitive Christian community. Bultmann has said, "I do indeed think that we can now know almost nothing concerning the life and personality of Jesus, since the early Christian sources show no interest in either." Not all who have made use of the form-critical method have shared Bultmann's scepticism. Indeed there has been a veritable spate of learned articles in which his position has been criticised and especially his attempt to demythologize the New Testament. The volume of scholarly literature has grown apace. Many more of us are aware of its existence than have opportunity to study it. Some have been touched by the contagion of uncertainty if not of mild scepticism. In their thought and devotion they have come, imperceptibly perhaps, to rely less confidently upon the witness of the Gospels and upon the person of him to whom they bear witness.

For such there should be a measure of encouragement in the recent work of certain scholars interested in this area of New Testament research. It may indeed be, as Vincent Taylor has suggested, that we are "entering upon a period of greater constructive activity." One thinks of such works as Dodd's article on "The Framework of the Gospel Narrative" now published in his *New Testament Studies*; of Hunter's *Work and Words of Jesus*; of T. W. Manson's study of the public ministry of Jesus, *The Servant-Messiah*; and of Vincent Taylor's *Life and Ministry of Jesus*, an enlarged version of his article under the same title in the *Interpreter's Bible*. Most recently T. W. Manson has contributed to the series of studies in honour of C. H. Dodd, *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, a survey of the tendencies in present-day research in the life of Jesus. Out of his long study he makes the following affirmation:

> I am increasingly convinced that the Marcan story presents in the main an orderly and logical development; and that this development or framework has as good title to be considered reliable historical material as any particular anecdote incorporated in it.

And he ends his discussion with these words:

> There is no escape from the historical inquiry. And there is no need to be despondent about its prospects. We may venture to hope that as it progresses, we shall find that the Ministry of Jesus is a piece of real history in the sense that it is fully relevant to the historical situation of its own time, to the hopes and fears, the passionate convictions and the gnawing needs of our Lord's own contemporaries. And just because it was so relevant to their life, we shall find it relevant to our own.

The other day a Canadian bishop explained to one of his more recently consecrated fellow-bishops that when he had to make decisions where he had no precedent to guide him he was guided largely by his knowledge of the character and teaching of Jesus. This for him was a practical guide in his high office. It is probably not without significance that when he ordained a young man deacon he not only presented him with a Greek New Testament as the liturgy and custom required but gave him as well a copy of Turner's *Work and Words of Jesus*. A missionary in discussing the manner of the presentation of the gospel to prospective converts explained that it was first of all necessary to tell them stories about Jesus. Then when they had come to know and admire him it would be proper to explain the meaning and purpose of his life and death and resurrection. A recent questionnaire showed that one of the questions young teen-agers most frequently wished to have answered was: Did Jesus really live? What was he really like?

The urgent and vital importance of the life of Jesus for the life of the Christian and the Church which the above may be taken to illustrate but emphasises the truth of some words of F. C. Burkitt, written long ago in a

preface to a life of Christ with which he found himself in not too great sympathy. "To make a Portrait of Christ, each man for himself, is the duty of every Christian, of whatever school of thought and practice. It cannot really be done second-hand, by others, if the Figure is to have any vital or compelling influence."

M. T. N.

# The Meaning of Baptism

THOMAS F. TORRANCE

WHAT is the meaning of Baptism? That faces us right away with serious questions of New Testament interpretation which it would not be right to set aside. It was Friedrich Schleiermacher, more than a hundred years ago, who posed for us the two main problems which are still being debated. (1) Interpreters of the New Testament have to face the fact that while the language of the New Testament comes from the Greek world, the thought of the New Testament emerges out of the world of Hebrew Religion. Thus even though the words remain the same the inner meanings are different, so that something more than a grammatico-historical interpretation is necessary. The solution which Schleiermacher offered lay in psychological analysis. (2) In regard to the actual content of the New Testament Schleiermacher drew a radical distinction between what he called the "sensuous" and the "spiritual" elements in it, and advocated the reinterpretation of the "sensuous" into the "spiritual" by means of the religious consciousness.

To both these problems Schleiermacher offered a fundamentally subjectivist solution which came to exercise a dominant influence in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, still apparent in the views of Rudolph Bultmann. Certainly the idiom has changed, but the issues remain the same, while the solution offered is still rather subjectivist. Instead of psychological analysis, we have existential analysis; instead of the distinction between the "sensuous" and the "spiritual," we have a distinction between the "mythological" and the "scientific;" and instead of the religious consciousness we have self-understanding. Yes, the idiom has changed, but it is doubtful whether Bultmann has taken us much beyond Schleiermacher.

But what of the other side of the picture? Against this whole movement of idealistic and existentialist reinterpretation of the Christian message there has been growing up a massive revolt. In its secular form this revolt is most apparent in Marxist thought and its movement down to earth and work-a-day humanity. In its Christian form this revolt is seen most clearly in the recovered emphasis upon the Incarnation and the reconciliation of man in his flesh and blood reality to the living God. It is with the latter that we are concerned here: with the return to a Christian realism, and a theological objectivity.

All this requires of us an interpretation of the New Testament at a deeper level. Schleiermacher's hermeneutical analysis went to the heart of the matter, but his solution does not meet the demands of scientific objectivity. We cannot bypass the real problems by psychology. We have to take the speech of the New Testament with all its Hellenistic affiliations and by arduous historico-critical study of its usage in the actual life and worship

of Israel and the Church build up a correct understanding of the distinctive meaning of the New Testament concepts. This impels us to think out the whole relation of the Church to Israel, of the New Testament to the Old Testament, and of theology to worship.

At the same time Schleiermacher's radical dichotomy between a realm of sensuous events and a realm of spiritual ideas must be rejected on the ground that it mutilates the actual evidence and denies the very essence of the Gospel of the Incarnation. It disrupts the whole significance of reconciliation which involves not only the reconciliation of man with God but the binding together into a new unity of the two aspects which Schleiermacher wanted to divide asunder. Much the same argument must be advanced against Bultmann's programme of demythologisation.

This means that it is the doctrine of Jesus Christ who is God and man in one person, and who wrought out in Himself the reconciliation of man to God, which comes again to assume the central role in theological interpretation which it has always had in the heart of the Gospel.

What then are some of the theological issues raised about Baptism?

The New Testament writers employ an unusual word for baptism and attach to it a distinctive meaning. This is the term *baptisma*, which is to be interpreted in much the same way as another important New Testament term, *kerygma*. *Kerygma* refers to the proclamation of the Gospel, and yet not so much to the proclamation itself as to what is proclaimed, namely, Jesus Christ; not so much to the act of proclaiming as to the saving work of Christ. When the Gospel is proclaimed it is Christ Himself the crucified and risen Lord who is present and active for our salvation. Similarly in regard to Baptism, the New Testament is not interested so much in the outward rite as in what stands behind the rite; not so much in the subjective experience of the baptised as in the death and resurrection of Christ; and therefore it is not interested in the human minister but in the One into whose name we are baptised.

This is not to say that the outward rites are dispensable; on the contrary, they are quite indispensable; but the main focus of attention is directed on to the objective reality in the person of Christ and His finished work on our behalf. This indicates that Baptism is to be interpreted not in relation to what we do but in relation to what God in Christ has done and will do for us; its meaning does not lie in the rite itself and its performance, or in the attitude of the baptised and his confession of faith, important though they are. It lies beyond—in Christ. It was not baptism that was crucified for us, nor was it faith that was crucified for us, but Jesus Christ. It is therefore only with the greatest reserve that we can speak, as the New Testament does occasionally, of faith or of baptism as saving us. Certainly we are summoned to believe if we are to be saved; and we are commanded to be baptised; but baptism tells us that though faith is required of us it is not by our believing that we are saved but by Christ Himself.

But this raises another issue. We are not baptised into the name of Christ

only, but also into the name of the Father and of the Holy Spirit. This is very important, for it indicates that the meaning of Baptism cannot be determined exclusively with reference to Christ. Baptism is concerned with the eternal love of the Father and with His gracious decision to reconcile us in His Son, and to adopt us as His children; and it is equally concerned with the sanctifying and renewing work of the Creator Spirit. Thus Baptism in the name of the Father speaks of the prevenient love of God, and tells us that long before we learned to love and believe in Him He loved us and chose us to be His own; and Baptism in the name of the Holy Spirit speaks of the supernatural presence and work of God, telling us that our coming to love Him and our learning to believe in Him are the creative work of the Holy Spirit within us. It is only within that context of Baptism in the name of the Father and of the Holy Spirit that we can speak rightly of Baptism in the name of Christ.

On the other hand, because the eternal love of God was incarnated in Jesus Christ, and because the Father sends us His Holy Spirit in the name of Christ, it remains true that the significance of Baptism is essentially Christocentric. Two primary aspects of Baptism have to be mentioned in this connexion.

(1) Baptism is into the name of the whole Christ, not just into the name of the dying and rising Christ, but the Christ who was born of the Virgin Mary, who was baptised at the Jordan, in fact the whole historical Jesus. Baptism into Christ includes therefore a sharing in His birth and His human life, as well as in His death and resurrection. When were you born again? In your conversion? In your baptism? The profoundest answer you can give to that question is, when Jesus Christ was born from above by the Holy Spirit. The birth of Jesus was the birth of the new man, and it is in Him and through sharing in His birth that we are born again. Modern theology has tended to neglect the reconciling and renewing significance of the birth of Jesus—but that is, I believe, an important element that needs to be restored to the doctrine of Baptism. If the miraculous birth of the infant Jesus is the sign of the wonderful way in which the Love of God begins with our humanity, bringing forth out of it a new life born of the Spirit, learning obedience and growing in wisdom and grace, then is it not in sacramental likeness to the birth and growing life of Jesus, as well as His death and resurrection, that infant baptism is to be understood as the sign of the way God deals with us? On the ground of what He has already done for us in Christ He quickens us by His Spirit and gives us to learn obedience, growing in wisdom and grace, until we grow up into the full stature of the manhood of Christ.

(2) When Jesus was baptised at the Jordan, identifying Himself with the sinners He had come to save, God the Father openly acknowledged Him as His beloved Son and the Holy Spirit manifested His descent upon Him. That not only pointed back to Jesus' birth of the Spirit as the One who had come to save men from their sins, but it pointed forward to the death of

Jesus on the Cross when He was to fulfil the whole work of atonement. That is the objective reality of our Baptism which witnesses to it and shows it forth. When we are baptised in the name of Christ, we are baptised into a work that has already been completed on our behalf in the whole course of Christ's obedience, from His birth to His resurrection. Baptism is not the Sacrament of what we do but of what Christ has already done and which we could not do for ourselves. Baptism is the divinely-given ordinance which directs us and our children not to something which only becomes real when we believe, but into the saving act of God's love which He has already fulfilled for us in Jesus Christ, and into which we enter as the great inheritance offered to us in the Gospel.

We must now turn to the place of faith in regard to Baptism. The fundamental significance of faith lies in the fact that in it man takes refuge from his own frailty and instability in the steadfast love and unswerving faithfulness of God. Only when we think of Baptism truly as the attestation not of our faith but of God's faithfulness, as the sign and seal not of something that begins with our human decisions but with the prior decision of Christ, can we give faith its full place. It is not enough to say that the primary emphasis is upon the initiative and the work of God, and that the subsidiary emphasis is upon the response of faith. Even if my salvation depends on God for ninety-nine per cent of its efficacy and only one per cent on me, my salvation is nevertheless as uncertain as my own frailty and weakness. The strength of the chain is to be measured by the weakest link. No, we are to think of this in another way. We are entirely dependent upon the divine decision, but that is a decision which overlaps and undergirds my decision and gives it ground and room and freedom for full personal activity. When I take my little daughter out for a walk, holding her by the hand, and she stumbles, she does not rely so much on her little grasp of my hand as on my strong grasp of her hand. It is when her little grasp is wholly enfolded in my own that it is secure and reliable.

Let me illustrate that from the Gospel account of the conversion of Zacchaeus. Some people interpret this by saying that Jesus saw that Zacchaeus had it in him to be a disciple, and that behind his wicked greed there was embedded an essential goodness, and so Jesus waited long enough in Jericho to draw it out of him and to effect his change of heart. There is no evidence in the record to substantiate that. What we are told is that this wicked extortioner wanted to see Jesus without being seen by Him; short in stature, he hid in a tree where he could observe Jesus as he liked without being noticed. But Jesus broke into the fortress of this man's security and announced His decision that He intended to lodge in Zacchaeus' house, and He told him to make haste and come down. Then the astounding thing happened. This man who did not have it in him to change his heart, who was not free to rid himself of his own selfish will, found himself free to make a decision for Christ, because Christ had already made a decision on his behalf.

That is the very heart of the Christian Gospel: that the Son of God has come into our world where men are enchained in their self-will and crushed down with the responsibility for their sins, in order to take that burden wholly upon Himself and to give an account of it to God. "Come unto me all you that labour and are heavy laden and I will give you rest," Jesus says. That is the Gospel which cannot be truly preached in such a way that the awful responsibility for our sins and for our salvation is taken off the shoulders of Christ the Lamb of God and laid back again on the head of the poor sinner. It is because Christ has already shouldered the burden of our sin and in our stead has given an account of it to God, that He makes it possible for us freely to believe in Him to love God and our neighbour.

There is one more question we must discuss: Baptism as the sign and seal of regeneration. The whole point of this aspect of Baptism is missed if two primary facts are forgotten. (1) The concept of regeneration applies first of all to Christ Himself, to His birth of the Spirit and to His resurrection from the dead. Christ is the One in whom the regeneration of our humanity has already taken place. (2) The concept of regeneration is also applied by the New Testament to Christ's second Advent in power when He will come to judge the quick and the dead and renew His creation. Baptism as the sacrament of regeneration is the ordinance of promise given by Christ to His Church in its life between His two Advents, between what has already taken place in the Incarnation and what will take place in the resurrection. It is not of course the rite of Baptism which regenerates, but in Baptism our regeneration in Christ is declared, and shown forth, and promised: it is *sacramentally* enacted as an image and likeness of the birth and resurrection of Christ. But our regeneration is more than a symbolic likeness of the birth and resurrection of Christ. It is their effect upon us, and yet not effect in the sense of a different and subsequent event. Our regeneration has already taken place and is fully enclosed in the birth and resurrection of Christ, and proceeds from them more by way of manifestation of what has already happened than as new effect resulting from them. It belongs to the peculiar nature of Baptism that it promises us a redemption which has already been accomplished in Christ; and therefore in Baptism the end is already given to us in the beginning. Baptism is not simply the starting of a process which we have to carry on and to which we have to make our own additions if we are to be saved. It is the initiation into a wholly new life which has been freely bestowed upon us in Christ, and which awaits His coming again for its full revelation and consummation. That is why the promise of Baptism and its fulfilment cannot be tied down to the enactment of a ceremony or be exhausted in this life. It is a promise that is valid for the whole of our life and reaches out beyond into the resurrection and the new creation.

When we look into the waters of baptism we see our faces reflected in it, not very clearly, but very brokenly. In the Sacrament of Baptism we see the

image of our regeneration only, as it were, "in a glass darkly," in an enigma. It is essentially a sacramental mystery which under the veil of water directs us back to the work of our renewal which has once and for all taken place in Christ, and directs us forward to the day when we shall see Jesus face to face and become like Him.

# The Expression "Word of God" in Scripture

DAVID W. HAY

THE habit of referring to the Bible as the Word of God has disguised the fact that the expression has a multiplicity of uses in Scripture. The purpose of this article, which can only be summary in its treatment, is to identify and analyse these uses.

## 1. The Word of God is God Himself

*The Word was God.* John 1:1

There are not many places in Scripture where this affirmation is made, for the Bible is concerned more with God's relation to his creatures than with what he is in himself. The great self-announcement of Wisdom in Proverbs, which lies behind the Johannine saying, comes near it.[1] Other references to the pre-existent Word, while not irrelevant at this point, belong rather to our next one.

This Word, isolated as pure divine spirit, is incapable of being heard by man. The obstacle to be first considered is not sin, but fleshliness or materiality, which excludes us in this life from purely spiritual relations with God. "No man hath seen God at any time" (John 1:18). Since God has not a physical body and man's knowledge is conditioned by the senses, God cannot be seen by the human eye. The same truth applies to the ear. God no more has a voice to be heard than he has a face to be seen. "Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape" (John 5:37). This saying is in St. John alone, and yet is basic to the whole Biblical doctrine of God. We gravely misunderstand Scripture if we interpret any of its passages as recounting revelation apart from creaturely, indeed fleshly, mediating factors, actual or visionary. An excellent illustration of this principle, despite accompanying problems, is in the thirty-third chapter of Exodus. "Thou canst not see my face; for there shall no man see me, and live" (v.20. Cp.v.23). There is no contradiction here of what is said shortly before: "And the Lord spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend" (v.11). The earlier verse emphasises the directness of the revelation; the latter, like the last few words of the chapter, emphasises its mediacy. Both truths are finally held together in the affirmation that what Moses actually saw was God's *back*.

The mystery of communication even on the human level is that at one and the same time we know one another directly, as spirit meeting spirit, yet only by means of bodily relations. Our "spiritual" relations are not

1. Prov. 8:22. Cp. Col.1; 17; I John 1:1; 2:13.

arrived at by means of inferences or deductions from bodily relations, even though there be inferential elements present. Spiritual relations belong to the stuff of experience, as do our bodily perceptions. Yet we never have purely spiritual experience of one another or of ourselves. Knowledge of persons is always mediated knowledge. Experience of God is analogous. But it has to be strongly borne in mind that the mediating factors in divine revelation are never themselves divine. A double conclusion follows. The fundamental form of the Word of God is God himself in his unmixed being. But this is a Word that no mortal has heard or can hear.

### 2. The Word of God is the Voice of Creation

*All things were made by him . . . and the life was the light of men.* John 1:3ff.

The act of creation is also an act of revelation. The term *Logos* might well mean that revelation is the prior thought. It has been well said that the early chapters of Genesis, to which John is alluding, are as much the story of revelation as the story of creation (Cp. Rom.1:20). Fleshliness or creatureliness is not simply obstructive to revelation but a vehicle of it. Again we can find a simple human analogy. Machines are artefacts that reveal their maker. The old-fashioned attempt to "explain" man as a machine is an absurd failure to realise that there cannot be machines without an accompanying superior being whose marks are upon them. Similarly, while the creation endures, God is perpetually united with something non-divine by which in principle he stands revealed to lesser spirits.[2] The first hearing of the Word is the hearing of God's "voice" in creation, and the first unveiling of his person is his covering himself with light as with a garment.[3] The very principle of sin in one aspect is that it is the vitiation of revelation. "If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!"[4] If, then, God is to reveal himself to us as we now are, two barriers have to be crossed, viz. fleshliness and sin. Too often the latter barrier is confusedly made to explain everything, but it now becomes relevant. To reach the sinner truly, the Word must come in a form additional to the revelation in creation.

### 3. The Word of God as Event in History

*For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.* John 1:17

A new revelation cannot be given as a merely natural event. It must enter the human world, the historical order, in a way that can lay hold of sinful men as personal minds and wills. The great message of the Bible, apart from which any study of it misses the point, is that God has taken revealing and redeeming action upon the stage of history. The Johannine text at the head

2. See Augustine's famous passage: *Confessions* 10:6.
3. Pss. 19; 104:2; Heb. 11:3; 2 Pet. 3:5.
4. Matt. 6:23. Cp. Rom. 1: 21ff.

of this section is a summary of the Biblical message that the Word has entered history in two related ways, by Israel and in Jesus Christ.

### (i) *The Word as Old Testament Event*

For reasons already discussed, the transcendent, invisible God can act within the human world only in a mediate way. The Exodus is the most striking Old Testament example of God "showing his hand" by an historical event. "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage" (Exod. 20:2). In the event, he "gave them his name," or revealed himself. That is to say, he gave his Word. The special events of Israel's history were signs by which God spoke to those who had ears to hear. There are many kinds of events, on a large scale or a small, in which God is represented in the Old Testament as revealing himself, whether it be in Amos's plumb-line, Jeremiah's almond-branch, or national events.[5] Revelation is always accompanied by a sign of some sort, even though ultimately it be the quite down-to-earth one of the moral and spiritual state of the people.

### (ii) *The Word as New Testament Event: the Incarnation*

*The Word was made flesh.* John 1:4

Christ is at once both Word and event. He is in a special manner the Word of God, because the mind and will of God can be embodied in a person as in no other kind of creaturely manifestation. The Son is the brightness of his glory and the express image of his person (Heb. 1:3). In his person and action he is the Word of God before ever he speaks a word. What has already been said about revelation by events will help us to understand what is meant by the Incarnation. We shall also recognise that this doctrine of the divine embodying itself in the creaturely is already in principle in the Synoptic Gospels, and therefore the notion of incarnation gave no embarrassment to men like the Apostles who were reared in a strict monotheism. If a sign is an event by which God directly yet mediately participates in the human scene, there is no particular difficulty—though necessarily there is much mystery—in Christ's being Immanuel, "God with us."[6] We have here the foundation of a truly Biblical Christology.

## 4. The Word of Human Testimony

The three forms of the Word of God that we have considered so far belong entirely to God in himself and his own action. But the salvation-story becomes fully historical only by means of human testimony in which it is articulated and made the basis for human action. In the Old Testament, the interpreters are the prophets, and in the New Testament the Apostles, the prophets, their companions, and their successors.

5. Amos 7:2ff.; Jer. 1:11; 21:2.
6. Matt. 1:23; Cp. Luke 2:12.

### (i) *The Word of the Prophets is the Word of God*[7]

*There was a man sent from God, whose name was John.* John 1:6

In terms of the principles with which we are working, the place of the prophets is not hard to understand. Inspiration means that the will of God embodied in events becomes so clear to a prophet that he utters it in human words with all the authority of God. In so far as men shape their conduct upon this revealed Word, there emerges a new, divinely guided and sustained community on earth. It is true not only of the Christian Church but also of Israel that it is founded upon prophecy. It is for this reason that the figure of Moses, the paragon of prophecy (Deut. 18:15), looms so large in the Old Testament and that even the historical books in the Old Testament were known as "the Former and the Latter Prophets." The Exodus could not have taken place apart from Moses, who was under God its agent and interpreter. The effort still being made by some to defend the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is a perverted expression of the fundamental truth that there could have been no Bible without the inspiration of Moses and his successors.

### (ii) *The Self-Testimony of Jesus*

*Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.* John 1:17

If the words of the prophets were Word of God, the words of the Word Incarnate were Word of God *par excellence*. One does not intend by this assertion to suspend the human limits imposed by the Incarnation upon the words of Jesus, but to rescue the centrality of his testimony to himself from the tendency to merge it in that of the Apostles, or, even worse, in that of the Old Testament prophets. The idea that St. Paul created the Gospel out of the events of the life of Jesus is an absurd idea. The inspiration of the Apostles was derivative from the inspiration of Jesus, whose mind and will gave to the events of his life the shape that they took.[8] Christ would not have gone to Calvary without first instituting the sacrament which is the prophetic sign of what was really occurring on the Cross. Moses interpreted an event, the deliverance from Egypt, in which he was involved but which went beyond his person. With Jesus, there was no event to point to, save what he himself was and did. In him, prophet and event, Word and sign, coalesce. To separate the words of Jesus from the testimony of the Apostles, or to try to get behind the "Christ of faith" to the "Jesus of history," or to seek a "simple" Gospel regarded as something different from the "dogmas of the Church," are all examples of the single error of failing to see that Christ's own words are the prophetic source of all later articulations of the Word. The Puritan scorning of "pistling and gospelling' arose from ignorant reforming zeal, for the age-old emphasis upon the reading of the Gospel rests upon the theological primacy of the words and life of Jesus.[9] Apostolic

7. Exod. 4:22; Num. 24:13; Amos 3:8; *et passim.*
8. John 3:34; Acts 10:38.
9. H. Davies, *The Worship of the English Puritans*, p. 67.

words, it is true, are Christ's words, but they are his words in the mouth of another, whereas his words during his earthly visibility, both before the Resurrection and during the forty days before the Ascension, are his words in his own mouth, and therefore Word of God in an unparalleled sense.

### (iii) *The Testimony of the Apostles is Word of God*

*He first findeth his own brother, Simon, and saith unto him, We have found the Messias.* John 1:41

As the Exodus could not have been effectual revelation apart from the interpretative agency of Moses, so also the revelation in Christ would have been ineffectual without the inspired participation of the Apostles. The joy with which Jesus hailed the confession of Peter was joy in Peter's dawning prophetic consciousness (Matt. 16:16 ff.). We have here no ordinary confession of faith, by reason of which Peter is to be reduced to the level of all Christians. Protestant exegesis, out of a fear of Rome's use of this text and out of an untheological fear of human mediation in divine things, endeavours to minimise Peter's significance. But what was given to him, standing—as we never can—in the fleshly presence of the Revealing Event, was a prophetic discernment that made him, like Moses, the rock upon which the Church was built (Cp. Eph. 2:20). For this reason, Jesus took pains, beyond any that he took with the general public, to instruct the Twelve in the mysteries of the Kingdom (St. Mark 4:10 ff.). Most of all, an Apostle had to be an eye-witness of the Resurrection (Acts 1:21 ff.), for this event supplied the divine key to the meaning of the person and work of Jesus. When these men preached the Gospel, their word was prophetic Word of God.[10]

## 5. The Written Word is Word of God

*. . . the scripture cannot be broken.* John 10:35

It is a revealing fact that the expression *Word of God* is not used in the Bible with reference to writings. Orthodox emphasis upon the Book has reversed the Biblical emphasis upon the living forms of the Word. But wrong conclusions must not be drawn from this fact, for undoubtedly the prophetic word was not thought of as less inspired for being written down. It received rather an enhanced authority thereby. All references to "the Scriptures" imply their divine source and authority.[11] The fact that the more living forms of the Word figure more prominently in the Bible arises from the forward-looking character of revelation. Under both dispensations, the people of God lived in a tradition that was moving to a consummation. The letter kills only when it binds a people to ancient loyalties and nothing more. The Word that they had recorded was full of promise. Its divine sanction became all the more indubitable as the holy community "canonized" it. We can see in the New Testament the emergence of the Christian Scriptures (2 Peter 3:16).

10. I Thess. 2:13 *et passim* in NT.
11. II Tim. 3:16; 2 Pet. 1:20, 3:16.

### 6. The Word of the Apostles' Successors is Word of God[12]

*How shall they hear without a preacher?* Romans 10:14

All the sayings in which the preaching of the Apostles is called Word of God apply in a secondary and dependent way to those who have received the Gospel from them. Christ's promise to his Apostles was surely for their successors also (Matt. 28:19f.). The first ordination by the Apostles brings out this point very well, for the immediate result, we are told, was that "the word of God increased" (Acts 6:7). "Now I," said Luther, "and any man who speaketh Christ's Word may freely boast that his mouth is Christ's mouth. I am certain that my word is not mine but Christ's Word, therefore my mouth must also be His whose Word it speaketh."[13]

### 7. The Indwelling Word

The idea is used in the New Testament of the Word dwelling in or among Christians and becoming a means of revelation. In Colossians the reference appears to be to prophecy and teaching, accompanied by hymns, and belongs properly to our preceding section (3:16). In Corinthians Christians are regarded as an epistle that can be read by all men (2 Cor. 3:1–3). Jesus summoned his followers to be the light of the world (Matt. 5:13 ff.). Christians are nowhere themselves called the Word of God. The term is naturally restricted to what they say or to the person of the Lord himself. The word *sign* would be the better one to use in this instance. The idea is worth noting, in opposition to those who wish to restrict the notion of witnessing to what Christians say.

Important considerations arise from this analysis, of which we must mention a few.

1. The Scriptural use of the expression *Word of God* and its allied terms is highly complex. We have enumerated above no fewer than nine of them (counting separately the sub-divisions in the second and third sections and ignoring the seventh section). Yet this complexity is by no means arbitrary. Each form is related in an orderly way to the others, according to dogmatic principles that should be clear from the discussion. In the order taken, each form involves or implies preceding forms but not those that come after. In other words, the element of mediation, that is, of accompanying creaturely or non-divine factors, increases with each successive form. A proper doctrine of the Word must give full acknowledgment to the presence of mediation in revelation and also to its entirely creaturely character. "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (I Tim. 2:5) is a truth that should not blind us to the other factors in which his mediation is set. The analysis should help us to see how his unique mediatorial office is related to the other media.

12. The question of the sacraments must be omitted on the grounds that our immediate concern is with *Word*, not *sign*, or rather, with the spoken sign.
13. K. Barth, *Doctrine of the Word of God* (E.T.), p. 107.

The falsity of fundamentalism (by which we mean the belief in the verbal inerrancy of Scripture) is in great part its avoidance of the complexity noted. Men want to have a simple notion of the Word and think they can achieve it by a simple identification of the Word with the Bible. The basic error is the tendency to confuse the first form of the Word with the fifth above (the written Word). Few are quite so naive or theologically perverted as to fail to admit the humanity of the Biblical writers, but all the theorizing of fundamentalists—for example, the assumption of an original uncorrupt manuscript—is to enable them to *ignore* the creaturely character of the Bible and to regard it as the voice of God without qualification. In short, they desire, as much as possible, to regard the fifth form as the equivalent of the first. The writer has found this analysis a potent help in delivering "conservative" students from the bondage of literalism.

2. While the Word of God comes to us mediately, and only mediately—how far mysticism is genuinely Christian mysticism depends upon how far it reckons with this fact—it nevertheless comes to us *directly*.[14] Mediacy does not in this connection mean remoteness. In communication among men the body and the senses are not a barrier to personal relations but a vehicle of them. A great part of the effectualness of preaching is due to the fact that the directness with which the preacher addresses us is an analogue as well as a vehicle of God's own direct address to us. The preacher is a sign that God is speaking by him. Mediacy in revelation must never be thought of in a temporal or spatial way, as if God were at one end and we at the other of a series of objects interposed between us. Every form of the Word is the first and ultimate form, God himself, standing forth directly by his chosen means as the present Living God. There is bad theology in the popular children's hymn, which says:

*Jesus loves me, this I know,*
*For the Bible tells me so.*

The Bible can tell us that Jesus loved Peter, or Zacchaeus, or others of his circle. But it cannot tell me that he loves me. Only the Holy Spirit can do that, taking the things of Christ and revealing them to me.

3. Word and medium must always be distinguished. Grace and the means of grace are not the same thing. The distinction is the primary one between the ultimate Word of God himself and all the creaturely factors by which that Word is revealed. The creaturely factors must never be regarded as themselves divine. Piety can hardly restrain itself from this idolatry, but idolatry it is. St. Paul, one of the greatest writers of Holy Scripture, described himself as an earthen vessel, "that the excellency of the

14. There is much need to regularise terminology at this point. The best word here is *directly*, not *immediately*, which would mean without mediation. Cp. J. Baillie's awkward expression *mediated immediacy* (*Our Knowledge of God*, pp. 178ff.), and the use of *indirect* in Barth's *Doctrine of the Word of God* (p. 191). We must start from the fixed usage that Christ is *Mediator*. It follows that for the Christian there can be no *immediate* or *unmediated* knowledge of God. The "I-Thou" relation with God should then be described as *direct*. The term *indirect* might be reserved for inferential knowledge.

power may be of God and not of us" (II Cor. 4:7). But a hymn-writer could not abide this low view of Scripture: "It is the golden casket, where gems of truth are stored."[15]

The distinction between Word and means is not a modern one. Paul's saying shows his awareness of it. It shows clearly in expressions used by the Westminster divines. Circumstances did not compel them, as they have compelled us, to explore the implications of the distinction, but it peeps out unmistakeably in their arbitrary use of small and capital "W's" in spelling *word* and *Word*. Their contemporary, Richard Baxter, draws explicit spiritual lessons, though not dogmatic ones, from the distinction: "To have creatures and means without God is an aggravation of our misery. If God should say, 'Take my creatures, my word, my servants, my ordinances, but not myself'; would you take this for happiness? If you had the word of God, and not the Word, which is God; or the bread of the Lord, and not the Lord, Who is the true bread; or could cry with the Jews, 'The temple of the Lord', and had not the Lord of the temple;—this were a poor happiness."[16]

Power to make the distinction between grace and means enables us to avoid the sin of idolatry in our theology, to avoid wrong defences of inspiration, and to avoid misunderstanding of the authority on which faith rests. Our certainty of the God who speaks to us in Scripture or by other means must not be turned into a quality of certainty or infallibility in the means. No doubt God can, if he cares, make men infallible. To deny, however, that he made the Scripture-writers infallible is not to restrict his power but to magnify it, according to Paul's principle that the excellence of his power is shown by his using vessels not worthy of their function. It is high time to see that Biblical criticism is not an obstacle to faith but a requirement of it. Lastly, the distinction enables us to say truly where the authority of our faith lies. When asked on what his faith rests, the Protestant is apt to say, "The Bible," and the Roman Catholic is required to say, "The Church." Both answers are examples of looking for something creaturely as a basis for faith, as if that were a more certain basis than God himself. Faith in God is not a human certainty. It is a superhuman one—and all the more certain for that. It cannot be had apart from the creaturely means: outside the Church there is ordinarily no salvation. But the means are not our rest. In other words, the ground of our faith must not be over simply stated. It rests on God himself, by mediation. But the injunction of Baxter must always be kept in mind: "Above all the plagues on this side hell, see that you watch and pray against settling anywhere short of heaven, or reposing your souls on any thing below God."[17]

15. W. W. How, *O Word of God incarnate.*
16. *The Saint's Everlasting Rest*, 10:2:6. The whole section is valuable on the subject.
17. *Ibid.*, 10:2:7.

# Preaching the Gospel To-Day*

W. MORRISON KELLY

EVERY minister seeking to preach the gospel in terms relevant for today has to be careful that he does not end by preaching that which is characteristic of today, rather than that which is characteristic of the gospel. It seems to have been no accident that fifty years ago, when humanism was at its flood and man was buoyed by the thought of his inherent capabilities, the emphasis should have been upon the human Jesus. Certainly an element of liberation from cold metaphysics came into preaching and the warm lovable Son of Man was made real to the congregation in a way which was not altogether unworthy. But only one aspect of the gospel was emphasised, the aspect which was agreeable to the outlook of the day. Within recent years the same tendency to conform to the "spirit of the age" can be observed. It is an interesting commentary on the pull of "today" that the most widely read religious book at present is *The Power of Positive Thinking* by Norman Vincent Peale. In its title are the two key words or phrases characteristic of the modern outlook—"power" and "positive thinking." Our technological age, with its remarkable achievements in science and industry, is alert to the value and the danger of power. It is also keenly interested in psychology; it has been brought up on the doctrine of right attitudes. I remember on one occasion visiting the Massachusetts Institute of Technology at Boston and coming out dazed by the revelation of the vastness and scope of scientific investigation. As I stood on the steps trying to regain my wits I observed across the Charles River a large building surmounted by a massive dome. It was the Mother Church of Christian Science. It seems to me no accident that these two institutions face each other at no great distance. Together, despite all their differences in techniques and ideology, they typify the outlook of our present age. In their endeavour to meet the needs of today preachers find a constant pull upon them towards the proclamation of the power of positive thinking.

It is important, therefore, before preachers become too involved in "today" that they should consider what the gospel is which they have been commissioned to preach. Not once but constantly throughout his ministry a man has to ask, "What is the gospel?" To say that the gospel is Jesus Christ Himself is but to have only part of the answer. Rather, as P. T. Forsyth has pointed out, "The gospel is a certain interpretation of Christ which is given in the New Testament." What is this interpretation? Every preacher is in debt here to C. H. Dodd for his analysis of the *kerygma*, that is the gospel proclamation by the apostles. Dodd claims[1] that "the main burden of the kerygma is that the unprecedented has happened: God has

*Presidential Address delivered at the meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies held at Montreal in June, 1956.

1. *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, p. 33.

visited and redeemed His people." In other words the gospel of the New Testament is of God in action in Jesus Christ. "The Christian gospel is not of a God who waited for man to discover Him throughout the mazes of nature and history and is ready to welcome such brave travellers as may battle their way to the hidden shrine. He is the God who has revealed Himself in His Son, who died for our sins and has opened the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers. He is the God who has come to us Himself in Bethlehem, and at Calvary, in the Resurrection and at Pentecost. All these are events of history but they are more. They are the characteristic actions and revealing acts of the Eternal God."[2]

A. M. Hunter, utilising Dodd's work, seeks to demonstrate that the pattern of the *kerygma* was threefold.[3] First of all, the claim was made that the events concerning Jesus were the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy. "This is that which hath been spoken by the prophets" (Acts 2:16); "to Him bear all the prophets witness" (Acts 10:43). Secondly, the *kerygma* gave an outline, however brief, of the life, death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus. He was born of David's line (Acts 2:30); He went about doing good (Acts 10:37f); He was crucified on a tree (Acts 5:30); He was raised from the dead by God's power (Acts 2:24, 32, 3:15); He is exalted to the right hand of God (Acts 2:33) and He will come again as judge and saviour (Acts 2:20, 10:42). In the third place the *kerygma* gave a summons to repent of one's sins, to accept the forgiveness to be found in Christ and to be baptized, and thus enter the fellowship of the redeemed (Acts 2:38, 3:19, 10:43).

This is the gospel which the minister is expected to preach today. It will be observed that it has four main characteristics. First, by its emphasis on the intervention by God in Christ it cannot avoid raising the difficult and disturbing subject of the supernatural and its effect upon human interests and activities. Second, by its enumeration of certain details concerning Jesus, it is tied to definite historical events. Third, by its insistence on Old Testament prophecy being fulfilled, it seeks to interpret history. Fourth, by its summons to men to enter the redeemed fellowship by the doorway of baptism, it presents men with the answer to their search for a true community, namely the church.

## I

There is only room in this article for a passing reference to the historical nature of Christianity. But it must be emphasised that no preacher is free to roam at will when he seeks to declare the gospel. All truly *Christian* preaching today must be focused on the biblical account of the life, teaching, death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ. No matter how much he may seek to utilise modern insights concerning psychology, sociology and the nature of the universe, the preacher must bring them all within the given

2. *Into all the World* (Church of Scotland statement on evangelism), p. 18.
3. *The Unity of the New Testament*, pp. 23–25.

historical pattern of the Bible record. If he fails here he succeeds merely in being a religious commentator and not a servant of the Word. Moreover, the record is definitive for him in that he must submit to what it says. In other words he must bring to the preparation of his sermon the objective appraisal of the historian. He does not begin with three illustrations, or even an idea, in search of a text. He begins with a text—whether it be a verse, a passage, a character, a biblical concept—and proceeds to examine all the critical-historical elements involved in that text before he makes any deductions concerning it. This does not tie him to declaring his text at the outset of his sermon, nor to giving a detailed examination of his critical researches. God forbid that the latter should be so! But it does determine his general approach to the task of preaching.

## II

The great problem, however, in preaching the gospel today is the assumption of the *kerygma* that God has intervened in history in Jesus Christ. Modern men do not take kindly to the notion of supernatural intervention in the realm of nature or the activities of individuals. The ordinary person today is persuaded that everything that happens in this world can be understood in terms of cause and effect and that whatever does not appear to conform to these terms is either a fraud or an illusion. For him nature is a closely locked system with no possibility of interference from without, for, of course, there is no "without" and anything that cannot be fully understood now will ultimately be explicable in terms of the system. The gospel was foolishness to the Greeks and it is still foolishness to modern man: but for a different reason. The Greeks did not deny the possibility of divine intervention; they lived in an aura of an other-worldly faith. It only seemed incredible to them that the revelation of the Absolute Being, the prime mover and controller of the world, should have come through a man crucified on a cross. But modern man finds the gospel foolishness right from the start when it confronts him with God in Christ, activity from without the closed system within the closed system.

One has the feeling that it is this factor which is the essential motive for Bultmann's plea for demythologising the gospel record. In a real way Bultmann typifies twentieth century man. Despite his claims to an objective historical approach, he looks at the gospel through the subjectivity of an individual conditioned by the scientific and philosophical pressures of his age. It is not the gospel story which really causes problems for Bultmann. It is his assumptions. The assumptions are all the more dangerous because they are unconfessed and unrecognised. In this Bultmann is a symbol of our era.

A recognition of this fact helps to determine the preacher's approach to preaching the gospel today. He must give thought and time not only to an explication of the gospel but also to the typical assumptions of today and, so far as lies in his power, to undermining these assumptions. Apologetics

is an essential weapon in modern preaching. Fortunately he will find that science itself can be a useful ally. There are very few able scientists today who still think and write in terms of the determinism so typical of Victorian science. Modern science prefers to talk about "probabilities" and "statistical averages." Indeed Professor Andrade can even speak about the principle of indeterminacy in the atom. Evidently when a series of electrons is fired at an aperture most of them will veer, say, to the right, but there is always an odd recalcitrant individualist among them that veers to the left! No one knows why there should be this indeterminate principle in the atom, but it makes modern science cautious of making dogmatic statements in the *ex cathedra* fashion so characteristic of its immediate predecessor. The ordinary citizen, however, whose scientific ideas are always out of date, seems to have no awareness of this fact. It must be part of the strategy of the preacher to enlighten him.

But in his effort to drive home the truth of God's intervention in Christ the preacher must also employ another weapon. It is one of attack along lines which have a peculiar appeal to modern man. A blessed phrase in our day is that of "wish-thinking." Constantly it is levelled against the religious position. It is not always realised how vulnerable modern assumptions also are to this description and assault. This is particularly true of the assumption that man lives within a closed system immune to invasion from a mythical "without." Let us look at it in this way. Modern man may not believe in the God who intervenes, the living God, but nevertheless, being man, he finds it necessary to believe in some kind of a God. Therefore, he believes in God as the sum total of all that is, or as the energy behind the world's energy, or as the power which has set the machinery in motion and now has left it to itself. This is a safe kind of God in which to believe—a sum total, an energy, an abdicating power. *We* can add up sums, *we* can employ forces, *we* can utilise power. Such a God is within our comprehension, its movements, manageable. As C. S. Lewis has put it:

> An "impersonal God"—well and good. A subjective God of beauty, truth and goodness, inside our own heads—still better. A formless life force surging through us, a vast power which we can tap—best of all. But God Himself, alive . . . that is quite another matter. There comes a moment when the children who have been playing at burglars hush suddenly: was that a *real* footstep in the hall? There comes a moment when people who have been dabbling in religion (man's search for God!) suddenly draw back. Supposing we really found Him? We never meant it to come to that! Worse still, supposing He had found us? So it is a sort of Rubicon. One goes across; or not. But if one does, there is no manner of security against miracles. One may be in for anything.[4]

Such is the God with which the gospel presents us, the living God, whom we do not control but who controls us and all that is. The more the matter is considered, however, the more it becomes apparent that it is only such an idea as this which can give any guarantee in respect of the regularity

4. *Miracles*, p. 114.

and the meaning of the universe. Unless there be behind and in this world such a living, acting and creating God then we have no assurance that "the laws of nature" mean anything. Apart from Him they may be no more than ideas in our own heads, interpretations we put upon a world which fundamentally is only the result of circuitous circumstance and has no pattern or rhythm. It is belief in the living, acting, creating God which saves us from the fearful abyss that any order which we find in the universe is no more than the reflection of our own desire to find such order.

But this understanding of the true guarantee of the regularity and pattern of nature's laws leads us to a new appraisal of the unexpected and the undefined. The living God is not bound by the world He has made. He is above it and can still create. He can create that, which, because of our limited knowledge, we cannot fully comprehend. "A miracle" as Augustine put it, "is not contrary to nature, but to what is known of nature."[5] In other words, from the side of God a miracle is but part of His eternal pattern, fitting into His all-embracing purpose, of which the nature we know and comprehend is but another part. This the Christian believes to be particularly so when the miracle under consideration is the Lord Jesus Christ.

Therefore to preach the gospel today with its emphasis on the divine intervention in Jesus Christ, is not to handle a notion which is out of date and of which one should feel diffident. Rather it is a theme which is relevant in that it makes sense of all modern scientific knowledge. The preacher should seek to hammer home the fact that it is only faith in the living, acting, unlimited God which gives men not only the assurance that they live in a coherent universe which can stand up to investigation, but also the guarantee that their very thinking and investigating are valid and fruitful.

## III

When we consider the third emphasis in the *kerygma*, namely that the intervention of God in Christ is the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, we are dealing with an issue which from the preacher's point of view has particular relevance today. Implicit in this emphasis is the assumption that history has meaning; it is under the control of God and the activities of nations and individuals subserve His purpose. It is an emphasis which must be in all modern preaching. For one thing, within Western civilisation there are many who can discern no meaning to what is happening in the world today. So far as they are concerned there is no pattern in world events; chaos is come again. To them in their tragic bewilderment there comes a voice which bids them see in the very chaos itself the clue to the meaning of history. Communism has a theory about history and a faith in history. It is, however, a this-worldly faith. Communism regards the process of history as an inevitable drive towards the triumph of the proletariat, and the chaos

5. *De Civ. Dei*, Bk. XXI, Chap. VIII.

of today as the death-throes of a doomed capitalism. This drive is for communism an immanent force. It needs no reference to any power without. The pattern has been written into the very constitution of the world's events and nothing can stop it.

The Christian gospel cuts across both this interpretation and the fear of those who think that history is no more than a blind stumbling in the dark. The gospel emphasis on the intervention by God in Christ is a reminder that history can only be understood from God's point of view. Where both the believing communist and the confused ordinary man go wrong is that they seek to interpret history from within history. Their theories are no more than human deductions. But essentially human beings by themselves cannot understand history. They are part of the flux and flow, subject to the confusions and the bewilderments of the events, and therefore fallible and liable to mistake in their judgments. In the final resort, what happens in this world can only be understood from outside this world, from a vantage point beyond the turmoil and confusion of the world. Obviously, however, no man can stand aside from the world or beyond the stream of time of which he is part. Before there can be any valid verdict upon history it must come from outside. The gospel claims that this has happened. God, who is above history and the world, has entered history and the world in Christ to reveal His purpose. "He hath made known to us," as Paul says, "the mystery of His will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself: that in the dispensation of the fulness of the times he might gather in one (literally, 'bring to a head') all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth" (Ephes. 1:9–10).

This must be an essential theme in all modern preaching. The preacher must strive to make men understand it. It gives the only answer to one of the major problems of our age. The eschatological note, for so long slurred over in the proclamation of the gospel, has become dramatically relevant. It has always been relevant, but the very turmoil of our period, the very mixture of despair and hope, has lit up in a most startling fashion the power and the pertinence of the Christian understanding of history, namely that history moves, and is now moving, to a great climax under the direction and control of the living God who in Christ has intervened in history to reveal what its path and purpose are, namely that all "the kingdoms of the world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ" (Rev. 11:15).

## IV

The fourth characteristic of the *kerygma*, namely the invitation to enter the redeemed community, does not altogether have an unwelcome sound in modern ears. Men today are making real efforts to establish true community. For one thing, on the national level, modern states no longer believe in rugged individualism. All of them, whether communist or capitalist, are committed to the idea that by legislation we should all bear one another's

burdens, so that in time of unemployment, sickness or old age none should be left destitute or uncared for. On the international level also the same search after community is to be discerned. The very existence of the United Nations Organisation is an indication of the awareness of the nations that they must either unite or burst in an atomic day of judgement. When the preacher speaks of community today he is dealing with a live subject.

Moreover, when he emphasises that it is of the *redeemed* community he speaks, he can still make contact. Society is beginning to recover from the naive belief that man "needs must love the highest when he sees it." It is now aware that if there is going to be established true community it will need a more fundamental element in its search than a faith in the reasonableness of human nature or in the ordinary citizen's horror of getting involved with the police. The waywardness of man has become today much more than an academic discussion point. It is the problem which haunts modern society in all its plans and hopes. The perennial claim of the gospel that man needs must be saved finds an answering echo today in the world. It is for the preacher by all the means at his disposal to drive home the gospel answer, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved and thy house" (Acts 16:31). Let him not forget the concluding part of that answer "and thy house." A proclamation of individual salvation does not do justice either to modern man's search for a true community or to the gospel view that the salvation wrought by God in Christ has a reference to the world in all its aspects and interests ("God so loved the *world* that He gave His only begotten Son" John 3:16).

In his proclamation of the gospel invitation to repent of one's sins, be baptized and enter the redeemed community the preacher has the inestimable comfort and help which comes to one who is not dealing with a merely theoretical issue but speaking from within a fellowship which gives reality and emphasis to what he has to say. What he preaches he does not preach as a lone individual, but as the representative and spokesman of the redeemed community. In a very real way the gospel which he proclaims is not his. It belongs to the Church, which throughout the ages has been the continuing witness to the great acts of God in Christ. No one can ignore the church today. It is the one answer to modern man's search for a community which will stand the assaults of time and the ravages of human tensions which thwart brotherhood. The church is not just another human organisation sustained by a spirit which rises no higher than merely human aspiration. It is the *ecclesia*, the assembly of those called and redeemed by God. It was God in Christ who made the church and it is His Spirit which has sustained it throughout the ages. All down the years the church has been attacked or ignored and yet it has survived, not because of its merits, but because God has a work for it to do. This work has always been relevant; today we are grasping how very relevant it is—that the middle wall of partition between individuals and nations be broken down (Ephes. 2:14).

It is from within the life of the church that the minister preaches the gospel today. He need not be ashamed either of the gospel or the church. Rather he should be aware that he and all those within the fellowship of the redeemed have a contribution to make to the healing of the hurt of the world, which no one else can make. It is a contribution not only of pertinent words and relevant ideas. It is, also, most vitally, a contribution of worship and life peculiar to those who have been honoured and humbled by God's saving grace in the Lord Jesus Christ.

# Canadian Universities and the Teaching of Religion

JOHN W. WEVERS

THE teachings of the Christian religion are omitted from the curriculum of the state-supported universities in all the provinces of Canada except Quebec. Courses in Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism are permitted and encouraged: but Christianity, the unloved mother of our Western culture, is moved into the attic rooms of Oriental Literature and Medieval Philosophy, or consigned to the lonely rest home of the theological college. She no longer occupies the queenly throne. The hands of history's clock have once more come round, so that Christianity, along with her Founder, is again relegated to a manger.

The "secular" university is an ill-begotten child, the product of an abortive age. This new age is founded on a new dichotomy. No longer is the world divided into the good and the bad. The dichotomy of the *civitas dei* and the *civitas terrena* is now outmoded. The modern fashion is to oppose the "secular" and "sacred" as somehow between them comprehending all knowledge.

I submit that this distinction is not only undesirable: it is a false one as well. The Biblical faith as rooted in the Hebraic thought-world did not recognize this dichotomy. Furthermore, the historical inception and conception of the university never envisaged any divorce between the secular and the sacred.

The thesis which this article is intended to develop has two parts. First of all, it analyses the Biblical faith, particularly as this is rooted in the Hebraic mind, to see whether there is any justification of the *purely* secular content of the curriculum of the state-supported university. To implement this investigation an analysis of the Hebraic concepts of "knowledge" and of "history" is undertaken. That the Hellenic sources of our culture might well lead to different conclusions is irrelevant to this study. All that is necessary is to demonstrate that the involvement of the religious in the so-called secular was a necessary presupposition of *one* of our cultural roots. Should this be the case, then it is clear that religious studies in the curriculum, for which provision is still being made in most Canadian Universities which are ecclesiastically supported, should be incorporated into the teaching programmes of our state-supported universities.

A second part of this paper is intended simply to support the conclusion of the first part. A brief survey of the origins of the university in medieval times soon convinces one that the divorce of the university from religion was not part of the original scheme of things at all. No modern university

would in any respect contemplate a return to the days of rigid authoritarianism; on the other hand, the question remains whether the baby has not been thrown out with the bath water in our emancipated curricula of today.

This is also substantiated by a brief survey of the ecclesiastical origins and affiliations of Canadian Universities. From this it appears that the state-supported university is in its present course turning its back on an important aspect of its task, an aspect which was seen much more clearly in the days when the Canadian universities were coming into being.

## I

The Biblical notion of *knowledge* inevitably concerns the worlds of good and of evil. Knowledge (Heb. *da'at*) never concerns God's eternal being, but always centres on his demands.[1] Knowledge is not a possession; it is a practice; it is an "ought" which must be actualized. Thus the knowledge of God is the recognition of God's might, grace and will. Ignorance, on the other hand, involves guilt, non-recognition of God. As such it carries the germs of self-destruction within it (Hos. 6:4).

Even in its most avowedly secular form this ethical bent to both knowledge and wisdom is clear. The conception of wisdom and instruction[2] in Wisdom Literature is that of practical morality (cf. Prov. ch. 1). It is discipline and reproof of the learner which is taught (Prov. 5:12); prudence (*'ormā*) is defined as heeding the admonition of one's counsellors, whereas the fool, the antonym of the wise man, is the one who despises his father's instruction (*mūsār*; Prov. 12:1; 13:1; 15:5). Wisdom finds its antonym in "pride," "arrogance," or even "wickedness" (Prov. 8:7). Israel is called a foolish and ignorant people because they have dealt corruptly with God.[3]

Such practical wisdom is religiously oriented. If one is wise, one listens to the warning to serve YHWH reverently (Ps. 2:10). Wise people are the ones who know their God, and will therefore stand firm and take action against the godless Antiochus Epiphanes (Dan. 11:32 f.).

The obvious corollary of knowledge thus defined is that it results in good conduct. Thus Jehoash did right in YHWH's sight because he had received priestly instruction (2 Kgs. 12:2). Training in youth will promote steadfast conduct in later life (Prov. 22:6). Heeding instruction serves other desirable ends as well, since one who does so assumes an honoured position in the community, whereas disregarding instruction leads to poverty and disgrace (Prov. 13:18).

Such knowledge has its source in God[4] who teaches men knowledge (Isa.

1. Cf. R. Bultmann, Art. "ginooskoo, ginoosis, epiginooskoo, epignoosis," *Theol. Wörterbuch zum N.T.*, Vol I (Stuttgart, 1933) 688–719.

2. The most recent study of *mūsār* as "discipline" and "instruction" is that of J. A. Sanders, *Suffering as Divine Discipline in the Old Testament and Post-Biblical Judaism* (*Colgate Rochester Divinity School Bulletin* XXVIII) 1955. For his discussion of the concept of instruction in the Book of Proverbs, *vide* pp. 32–45.

3. Deut. 32:6.

4. Cf. Joh. Fichtner, *Beih. z. ZATW* 63, pp. 177ff.

40:14; Ps. 32:8; 94:10; Prov. 2:6–7). Only if instruction comes from him is man rightly taught (Isa. 28:26; 48:17; cf. Ps. 25:9); instruction is actually defined as that which YHWH persistently teaches (Jer. 32:33). If men are thus instructed their prosperity will be great indeed (Isa. 54:13). Naturally what YHWH teaches are his statutes and ordinances, that is to say, his demands upon men (Ps. 119 *passim*; 132:12). YHWH's guidance is, however, not limited to this. The raw recruits of Israel's armies will be taught the art of warfare by YHWH himself (Jdg. 3:2); such military instruction even becomes the theme for psalmodic praise. (Ps. 18:34; 2 Sam. 22:35; Ps. 144:1).

Wisdom and learning may be variously mediated but in the last analysis they come by God's good spirit (Neh. 9:20). Skill in metal, stone, and wood crafts was given to Bezaleel and his able associates through a plenitude of the spirit of God (Ex. 31:1 ff.—P Code). Instruction may come in the sanctuary through an incubation rite,[5] that is, by a direct communication from God in a dream or visionary experience. Instruction may come through hearing God's words read (Deut. 4:36), or through careful observation of history (Deut. 11:2 ff.)—that is, through noting God's redemptive acts in Israel's history. Instruction may also be given by parents (Prov. 1:8; 4:1). In the Deuteronomic conception it was specifically Moses who in prophetic fashion taught Israel YHWH's statutes and ordinances.[6]

Wisdom, regardless of its dress, always involves "the fear of YHWH" (cf. Prov. 8:13). This is its basis in Wisdom Literature (Prov. 1:7). It is not always clear, however, what this term conveyed. It is in point of fact simply a technical term for the life lived in accordance with YHWH's demands. This is apparent from an examination of Psalm 34:11–14. The passage is in typical Wisdom literary form. The speaker addresses his audience as "sons," and promises to teach them "the fear of YHWH." Immediately he proceeds to define this by a summary of the Wisdom ideal:

> Guard your tongue from uttering evil,
> Even your lips from speaking deceit.
> Turn away from evil and do the good;
> Search out peace and pursue it.

It is by now clear that *da'at* is religiously oriented. In fact, only seldom is reference made to instruction in anything specifically non-religious. Training in war or in song does occur, but war was a religious duty and training in song is predicated only of the temple singers. Nebuchadrezzar wants Hebrew youths trained in the letters and language of the Chaldeans (Dan. 1:4), but this three year education programme was in a pagan court. So

5. Ps. 16:7. *Vide* J. W. Wevers, "A Study in the Form Criticism of Individual Complaint Psalms, *Vetus Testamentum* VI (1956), 95f. for an interpretation of this verse.

6. Deut. 4:1, 5; 6:1; cf. also 4:14 and 5:28. The prophet in a sense can be understood as such a mediator of divine knowledge according to the Priestly writer's definition of prophet in Ex. 7:1f., just as the wise man imparts his proverbs, Prov. 2:1; 3:1; 4:20 *et passim*. On the other hand, Qoheleth tried to attain wisdom by applying his mind to it, Eccl. 1:13, 17, though he does conclude that such study is much weariness to the flesh, 12:12.

too Moses was "instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" (Acts 7:22), but this also is not germane to our inquiry. When Jeremiah tells the women of Jerusalem to teach their daughters a lament (Jer. 9:20), it is a religious exercise, just as Moses' teaching to Israel the "Song of Moses" (Deut. 31:19, 22).

What is learned normally involves either the world of good or of evil. Men are warned against learning the abominable practices of the Canaanites (Deut. 18:9), or the idolatrous practices taught by foreign tribes (Deut. 20:18), or the "way" of the nations (Jer. 10:2ff). The Judaeans in Jeremiah's time had learned the evil Canaanite ways from their fathers (Jer. 9:14), and were now teaching others these wicked ways (Jer. 2:33). On the other hand, the Psalmist vows to teach transgressors God's ways (Ps. 51:13); similarly Qoheleth taught people proverbs, that is, the good life of the Yahwist (Eccl. 12:9). It is God's demands upon men which need to be learned (Ps. 143:10), which demands are incorporated in his righteous ordinances, statutes and commandments (Ps. 119:7, 71, 73). People are to teach their children God's words which in turn promote the fear of YHWH (Deut. 4:10; cf. 14:23). This learning process is to be both auditory and visual and is to go on constantly (Deut. 6:6–8; 11:9). In the eschatological age knowledge will be ideally complete for all men will then know YHWH (Jer. 31:34). It is by no means accidental that Ezra became the scribal ideal, since it is said of him that he had set his heart on studying the *tōrā* of YHWH, to perform it, and to teach his statutes and ordinances in Israel (Ezr. 7:10).

The thesis that it is not a secular/sacred dichotomy that occupied the Hebrew mind but rather the antithesis of a good *versus* a bad world has by now been amply documented from the Hebrew conception of knowledge.[7] It might, however, be suggested that this is what one might expect from a religious text such as the Bible. After all, this is precisely from the "sacred" realm, and it might plausibly be argued that its evidence is as such irrelevant. Two points ought to be borne in mind in this regard. First of all, the Hebrew conception in which the secular and the sacred are not distinct realms is not unique to the Hebrews; it was the view of reality commonly held throughout the ancient Near East. It would be surprising indeed to find among the ancient Hebrews such a modern distinction. In the second place, it should be kept in mind that it is precisely and only these Scriptures which constitute the Hebraic roots of our Western culture. Even if the Hebrews had compartments of life untouched by the sacred, they would be irrelevant.

## II

As a matter of fact the Old Testament as well as the New does, I believe, show clearly that such areas did not exist for its writers. This is clear even

7. It would merely be wearisome to analyse the New Testament concept of knowledge as well. It is based on, and is essentially the same as, that of the Old Testament. The interested student is referred for further study to the article by Bultmann listed in note 1 above.

from a superficial analysis of its conception of history. It matters little whether YHWH was originally a weather god at Sinai or not, or what the original significance of his name may have been;[8] it is clear that the Hebrews always thought of God as an active personality, inevitably involved in the course of Israel's history. Even the earliest Hebrew historian, the author of the "J" Code of the middle of the tenth century B.C.(?), conceived of history as "the act of God."[9] For this "father of history" YHWH may act in extraordinary and arbitrary fashion, but to his will one must bow.[10] Even in YHWH's earliest form, in his appearance to Moses before he had become covenantally allied to Israel as its God, he was greater than other local gods. His power was to be demonstrated in Egypt, certainly outside of home territory. YHWH's domain was never conceived by the J historian as limited to Canaan. In the tower of Babel story (Gen. 11:1–9) YHWH directs the course of mankind's history in the plain of Shinar; similarly he was active at Haran, giving travelling orders to Abram (Gen. 12:1, 24:7).

Furthermore YHWH is also in control over nature. He rained destruction over the Cities of the Plain (Gen. 19:24); he afflicted the waters of the Nile with disease so that the fish were destroyed; he brought on the plague of gnats, had control over the weather in Egypt, and directed the course of locusts there (Ex. cc. 7–10). It was YHWH who divided the waters of the Red Sea and at the right moment brought them together again (Ex. 14:21, 27). It was not Baal but YHWH who granted fertility to the patriarchal wives (Gen. 21:1 *et al.*).

But for J as well as for later writers YHWH is essentially the God of Israel. For this reason he blessed their patriarchal ancestors. He freed his people from the house of servitude; he led them victoriously into Canaan. The doings of YHWH find their actual purpose and expression in Israel's history. For J, history constitutes YHWH's redemption of his promise to Israel in spite of all kinds of hindrances which seem to bar the way.

The literary prophets too believed that YHWH was Israel's God, but drew new conclusions from it. Because of this favoured position Israel will be held doubly responsible for its sins (Amos 3:2). God will execute doom on his chosen ones at the hands of the heathen. In fact, YHWH's ethical concern extends beyonds the borders of Canaan. He will send fire on the fortresses of Damascus, the Philistine cities, Tyre, the Ammonites and Moab because they have violated the ordinary laws of humanity (Amos 1:3–2:3). In other words, YHWH's control over the destinies of men is not limited to Israel. Prior to Amos, YHWH's interference in other peoples' affairs somehow involved Israel: his real concern had been the fortunes of his own

8. For a recent summary and discussion of these problems cf. T. J. Meek, *Hebrew Origins* (2nd ed., 1950), pp. 82 ff.

9. John MacMurray, *The Clue to History* (London, 1938), p. 38.

10. For a thorough survey of the J writer's point of view cf. the late Gustav Hölscher's *Geschichtsschreibung in Israel: Untersuchungen zum Jahvisten und Elohisten* (*Skrifter utg. av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund*, 50), Lund, 1952. He speaks of the "Zug des Unheimlichen u. Unberechenbaren (dass) Jahve auch noch bei J behält" (p. 117).

people. Now YHWH's work has wider relevancy. In fact, it had been YHWH who was responsible for the course of non-Yahwist tribal migrations in former days such as those of the Ethiopians, the Philistines and the Syrians (Amos 9:8).

Not only does YHWH direct the course of all human history for the prophets, but he is also the lord of nature. It is YHWH not Baal who gives agricultural produce (Hos. 2:8ff.) or withholds it. In fact, the course of natural events is directed to an ethical end if Israel will but see it as such (Amos 4:6–12). Calamities such as famine, drought, crop diseases, pestilence, or earthquakes are used by YHWH as warnings of a coming judgment. YHWH concerns himself about every relationship in life whether it be to the natural realm, to one's fellow man or to God.

For the prophetic writers, YHWH's concern for the world is a necessary corollary to the fact that he is the Creator.[11] This is already apparent in the eighth Century. It is often suggested by interpreters of Amos that the so-called doxologies (4:13, 5:8f., 9:5f.) are later additions, intrusions in his thought. Such a judgment fails to take into account the necessary place of the creation motif. YHWH can make his demands upon Israel precisely because it is he who "forms the mountains, creates the wind, and declares to man his thought." Only the Creator "who made the Pleiades and Orion, who turns deep darkness into morning and darkens day into night, who calls for the waters of the sea to pour them out upon the earth, who builds his roof chambers in the heavens and who founds his vaults on the earth," only he can demand a strict account of men's actions.

Since YHWH is the Creator God his dominion extends throughout the world, and pagan men and nations will involuntarily submit to his direction. Assyria is the instrument in YHWH's hands for chastising Israel (Isa. 10:5–11). Jeremiah repeatedly refers to Nebuchadrezzar as the servant of YHWH to whom Judah and neighbouring lands will be given (Jer. 25:9, 27:6, 43:10). A half-century later the unnamed prophet of the Exile cites Cyrus of Persia not only as YHWH's shepherd (Isa. 44:28), but as his Messiah, his anointed "whose right hand I have grasped." (Isa. 45:1). Even God's saving power is not limited to Israel (Isa. 45:22f.); in fact, the Suffering Servant is to serve as "a light to the nations, that my salvation may extend to the ends of the earth." (Isa. 49:6).

This universal dominion of Israel's God is also evident from the prophetic notion of the "day of YHWH." Popularly this was thought to be a day of triumph for Israel but Amos opposes this widely held notion by his famous "Woe to you who desire the day of YHWH!" It is to be a day of darkness rather than of light, of terror rather than of triumph (Amos 5:18–20). This judgment is assumed to be world-wide in Isaiah, directed not only against Judah, but also against "the cedars of Lebanon, the oaks of Bashan, and the ships of Tarshish" (Isa. 2:12–22). The *Dies Irae* of Zephaniah

11. This particularly comes to expression in Deutero-Isaiah; cf. 40:12–15; 26, 28 e.g.

may begin in Judah and Jerusalem but will certainly spread to Philistia, Egypt and Ethiopia, as well as against Assyria. Gradually, however, prophetic thought changes, so that in Deutero-Isaiah YHWH's day is a day of triumph heralded by the return of the exiles to Jerusalem and climaxed by the universal conversion of the nations and their rulers to Yahwism (cf. Isa. 45:14 ff.; 49:7, 12).

It is by now fully evident that for the prophets YHWH is the Guide and Determiner of all history. Little need be said of the Deuteronomic historians of the seventh and sixth centuries, since they wrote under the impetus of the eighth and seventh century prophets. In a sense the apex of a theology of history was reached by Deutero-Isaiah in the sixth century, and later writers became more artificial in their presentation. This becomes particularly apparent in the Priestly writers whose schematic reconstruction of history is midrashic rather than historical.[12] History is an explanation of the origin of institutions by divine command. Gradually God's vision is delimited from Creation, to the family of Noah, to Abraham, to Moses and the Israelites. From then on God's interest is centered almost exclusively on Israel, and later on Judah and the Davidic dynasty. For P, God created the heavens and the earth in the beginning but the universe soon lost its appeal for YHWH in favour of his "peculiar people." History centered in the Levitical laws. History prior to their delivery in the desert was merely a preparation for them. All subsequent history was judged by subscription and allegiance to them.

The last Old Testament attempt at an understanding of history is apocalyptic, a form of writing which was to be become popular in later times, but is directly represented in Scripture only by the book of Daniel in the Old Testament, and the Apocalypse of St. John in the New.[13] To the writer of Daniel, God is of course supreme over history. Those who ravage the people of the saints of the Most High are only allowed to continue for a time. Everything in history is predetermined by the will of God, who rules the kingdom of men and sets over it whom he wills.[14] In the main, world empires tend to deteriorate. That of Babylon was symbolized by gold; the succeeding ones, by silver, by brass and by iron and clay respectively.[15] In spite of the pessimism with respect to past and present history, apocalyptic writing inevitably sets its hopes on a favourable outcome. The "contemptible person" will eventually fall (cf. Dan. 11:45). History is the ranging of the evil powers over against the good extending even to events in heaven (Rev. 12:7 ff.), but eventually "those who are wise will shine like the brightness of the firmament" (Dan. 12:2).

12. C. R. North, *The Old Testament Interpretation of History* (London, 1946) 107 ff.
13. An excellent handling of this type of literature may be found in H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (London and Redhill, 1944).
14. Dan. 4:17 *et al.*; cf. especially 11:36.
15. Ch. 2; cf. North, *op. cit.*, pp. 133 ff.

In the New Testament the day of the Lord is at hand (Matt. 3:2). In a sense it is a realized eschatology. The times were full (Gal. 4:4) and the Word became flesh (John 1:14). History has reached its climax in Christ, the divine Saviour and Lord of men. But history has taken on a new *telos*; the world is speeding to a consummation wherein Christ is to judge the living and the dead when he will reappear (2 Tim. 4:1 *et al.*). Citizens in the kingdom of Christ always stand under the judgment of grace. The New Testament pictures the *Anni Domini* as history's realization of this kingdom until Christ shall render it complete into the hands of the Father.

This is the faith which constitutes one of the two main roots of our modern culture, and because it is such it has been necessary to examine this at some length. I would submit therefore that the relegation of religion to the church, its exclusion from the University curriculum, is an unscientific procedure. The University exists to examine its culture and creatively to mediate it to tomorrow's citizens. The refusal to examine the roots of one's culture in the past is fatal to a university if it wishes to remain humanistic.

## III

Nor is the modern university justified historically in persisting in its so-called secular course. A course of study not dominated by ecclesiastical thinking would have been unthinkable in the Middle Ages. A "secular" university simply did not exist nor could it have done so. A brief review of the origins of the university easily substantiates this.[16]

The word "universitas" originally referred to a guild, either of masters as at Paris, or of students as at Bologna. It was a sort of confraternity or trade union, to which members belonged for mutual help and comfort. Such "universitates" ensured decent burial for their members in a hostile and foreign environment. Their formation seems originally to have been demanded by the hostility of the communities and the rapacity of landlords. The "universitas" constituted a tremendous weapon. In contrast to the modern university it had no buildings and existed wherever a group of scholars happened to be. Accordingly it could and often did "secede" from a given locale whenever its rights and privileges were infringed upon. This weapon of "secession" was as potent as a papal excommunication. Its invocation often brought emperors and popes to their knees and won extraordinary privileges for the members of the "universitas."

The actual institution or locale of such a university was the Studium. To have its licenses recognized, however, it had to be a Studium Generale, which meant the combination of at least one of the higher faculties along with the basic Arts Faculty. Whether the so-called "first" university, that

16. For the most complete account of these origins in English cf. Hastings Rashdall, *Rise of the Universities*, 2 vols. in 3, rev. ed. 1936, originally published under the title *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1895). For a general bibliography on the medieval universities, both original and secondary sources, see L. J. Paetow, *Guide to the Study of Medieval History*, rev. ed., 1931. For a fascinating account of the rise and fortunes of these universities based largely on Rashdall's work see N. Schachner, *The Medieval Universities* (London, 1938).

at Salerno, was such a Studium Generale, is not certain. Already in the tenth century it was famous as a medical centre, though it reached its height in the next two centuries. It was well-situated on the southwestern coast of Italy, at the crossroads of Latin, Greek, Arab and Jewish cultures. Galen and Hippocrates were studied in Latin translations, but later when the more esoteric and occult forms of Oriental medical practices became popular, Salerno gradually receded into oblivion.

In general, it may be said that Paris and Bologna were the two greatest centres of learning as early as the end of the eleventh century, each representing a different type. In the North—Northern France, Germany, England, etc.—the theological faculty predominated. Paris was the outgrowth mainly of the Cathedral School of Notre Dame, and was under the direct control of its chancellor. Here the "universitas" was a guild of masters whose license to teach, the *jus ubique docendi*, was controlled by the chancellor. By the end of the eleventh century students began to flock to Paris owing largely to the popularity of Abelard. Paris had all but one of the four higher faculties of Theology, Civil Law, Canon Law and Medicine, the exception being Civil Law. Supreme, however, was the Faculty of Theology. Of course, it had the basic Arts Faculty as well, which was the actual "universitas" as far as regulating the affairs of the university was concerned. Due to a threatened "secession" in 1200 of the university from the city, a charter was granted to it by Philip Augustus in which extraordinary privileges were granted to its members.

This was not the first charter granted to a university. In 1158 Frederick Barbarossa as king of Sicily and Naples had granted a general charter of privileges for students in Italy in his famous *Habita*. Practically speaking this meant Bologna, a completely different type of university from that of Paris. Besides the usual Arts Faculty, it had the two legal faculties, for which studies it was the European centre. But the "universitas" was one of students, not of masters. Since the masters were not foreign scholars as at Paris but local citizens, it was not they but the students who flocked to Bologna, banded together, and "ran" the university, dictating fees, lecture hours, local privileges, and so forth. Bologna became the Southern University type where Law and Medicine, not Theology, were the higher faculties. This became the pattern for later medieval universities throughout Italy, Spain and Southern France.

Mention has been made of Arts as the basic faculty. Arts comprised the seven liberal arts of the trivium and the quadrivium, i.e., grammar, rhetoric and logic on the one hand, and arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music on the other. Grammar was taught as a system of rules for Latin grammar, based on Donatus's textbook for beginners, and Priscianus for advanced students. Rhetoric was not a study of style, but pure pedantry, the treatises of Cicero and the elements of Roman Law being analyzed in strictly mechanical and unintelligent terms. The real centre of the trivium was logic where the logical works of Aristotle, the Latinized version of Por-

phyry's Introduction and the several commentaries of Boethius were assiduously studied. The Quadrivium by modern standards was almost meaningless. Arithmetic and astronomy were merely intended as means to calculate the date of Easter. Geometry was the presentation of a few of Euclid's propositions out of context, and of course without proof. Music was an unintelligible "jargon of pseudo-Pythagorean numbers and Psalter and Church music." The Course, though considered fundamental to the higher faculties suffered from the dominant hand of logic. The Classics were scorned since they could not be subject to syllogistic method. Furthermore they were pagan and impractical.

It was this impulse to subject everything to syllogistic method that caused the Medical faculties to languish in the Middle Ages, and Civil and Canon Law to flourish. Theology was the *regina scientiarum*, but by no means the most popular faculty except at Paris and to a lesser degree at Oxford. But the omnipresent power of ecclesiastical thinking moulded university instruction and learning. The principal of authority was a fetish. Aristotle and the Bible were sacrosanct as well as the Church Fathers. Only to a lesser extent were the works of Peter Lombard, Gratian and Averhoes in this same category. Knowledge was fixed and eternal, and the role of the university was simply to pass it on. Certainly the "secular" university had not yet been born.

## IV

The Canadian university scene was originally dominated by the ecclesiastically-supported college as well.[17] Only four universities in Canada, three of which were founded after 1900, do not admit of an original ecclesiastical connection, Saskatchewan in 1907, Alberta in 1908 and British Columbia in 1915. Unique in Canada is McGill, founded through the generous private endowment of James McGill. It had received its charter in 1821, and opened its doors to medical students in 1829. Manitoba was established in 1877, but it actually grew out of an affiliation of three denominational colleges: St. John's, St. Boniface, and Manitoba Colleges (Church of England, Roman Catholic and Presbyterian respectively). Since 1877 five other colleges have affiliated with it. It ought furthermore to be said that of the four universities mentioned above every one has one or more theological colleges affiliated with it.

The French-Canadians founded the first schools in Canada. Already in 1663 Laval was founded as the Grand Séminaire de Québec. It achieved university standing in 1852 when it received its charter. The Université de Montréal was originally a Montreal branch of Laval, but later achieved independent standing. Other Roman Catholic universities are St. Francis Xavier in Nova Scotia (1855), Université d'Ottawa (1866), St. Mary's College in Halifax (1860), and Assumption in Windsor (university status

17. A brief survey of the Canadian scene is given in R. C. Wallace, "The Universities in Canada," *The University Outside Europe*, ed. by Edward Bradby (Oxford, 1939) pp. 115 ff.

in 1953). Mention should also be made of St. Joseph's College in New Brunswick, Regiopolis in Kingston (1866) and St. Michael's College, federated as an arts college with the University of Toronto in 1910.

The Church of England has been responsible in Canada's history for the establishment of a number of schools. The earliest was King's College in Nova Scotia which achieved university status in 1802, and is now associated with Dalhousie University. The University of New Brunswick was also originally a King's College (1828), as was the University of Toronto. King's College, York (later, Toronto) was reorganized as a university without sectarian privileges in 1849, whereupon Bishop Strachan founded a new university under the name of Trinity College. In 1903 Trinity federated with the University of Toronto. Bishop's College was founded at Lennoxville in 1843, and Huron College, mother of the University of Western Ontario, was opened in 1863.

Presbyterians, Methodists and Baptists also founded colleges. Dalhousie University, originally endowed in 1818, made a permanent beginning under Presbyterian auspices in 1863. Queen's University, Kingston, a Presbyterian foundation, received its charter in 1841. The Methodists have been responsible for three colleges: Mt. Allison at Sackville, N.B., which became a university in 1858: Victoria, established at Cobourg in 1841, but removed to Toronto and federated with the University there in 1884: and Albert College in Belleville (1866). The Baptists founded Acadia University in Wolfville, N.S., in 1838, and they created McMaster University in Toronto in 1887 by joining two small colleges. In 1930 McMaster moved from Toronto to Hamilton.

It is apparent from the above catalogue of university beginnings that the Canadian University has in the main not been secular in origin. And yet in many of our universities no course in the teachings of the Christian religion is to be found in the curriculum. The invidious misinterpretation of the original intent of a policy of separation of church and state has promoted an unwarranted secularization whereby religion has become the naughty word of our Senior Common Rooms.

Such a course of action is the result of the intrusion of a false dichotomy in our thinking. That a university serving and subsidized by a Canadian citizenry should be non-sectarian is a principle with which no one can quarrel. That courses in Pauline thought, the history of the Christian church, and in Christian doctrine should be banned from university curricula is a disavowal of our cultural heritage and is historically unjustified. The Judaeo-Christian inheritance is a basic element in our cultural origins, perhaps the most important of all. Aside from the tragedy of ignorance on the part of many students with respect to their own religious heritage which this failure to teach religion on a "course" basis promotes, it also constitutes a distortion of this Judaeo-Christian heritage of ours, and a denial of the original intent of the university.

The process of secularization in the educational system has proceeded

much faster and farther in the United States than it has in Canada. A number of United States Universities are, however, aroused to the moral and cultural vacuum that is being created and have tried to meet this by the establishment of undergraduate departments of religion. Princeton, Columbia, Pennsylvania, Stamford, and many more have created such departments—with unexpected results. Courses in religion have been among the most popular on the campus. It is a dereliction of duty to leave this field in the hands of SCM, VCF and denominational groups. The fact that their excellent work is so successful shows that the university is failing in its primary function, namely, to aid the student in thinking out for himself a satisfying view of thought and action. A Department of Religion is not a luxury; it is an imperative.[18]

18. That the University's responsibility towards its religious heritage is being recognized by Canadian educators was convincingly demonstrated in University of Toronto President S. A. Smith's *President's Report for the Year ended June 1953*, pp. 1–4.

# Harnack Revised

E. L. ALLEN

HARNACK'S famous thesis, that the development of Christian dogma came about by the "acute Hellenization" of the original message, is still *sub judice*, and it is possible to accept it as a judgment of fact while repudiating the judgment of value that accompanied it in the first instance. Thus, from the Catholic side, the followers of Newman have maintained that it was divinely meant that a revelation given to Israel should be assimilated to Greek culture and so become universal instead of provincial. On the Protestant side, it has been urged that the Fathers, Irenaeus and Athanasius in particular, are much more Biblical and less metaphysical than Harnack averred, and that, while the form of doctrine changed, its content was not seriously affected by the process. Again, those who accept Harnack's principle may quarrel with him as to its application. But none of these critics would carry revision so far as would Martin Werner in the brilliant and informative survey *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas*, now in its second edition. It will come as a surprise to those in Britain who fondly imagined that Schweitzer was discredited to learn that he is the inspiration of the new and vigorous school of thought to which Werner belongs.

Werner accepts Harnack's thesis as established, but finds a grave omission in the execution of his project. He has not been able to give an answer to the question: What was it in the Christian message or its original situation that laid it open to the possibility of Hellenization? It is not sufficient to say with him that Apostolic Christianity was in part Jewish and in part universal, and that the latter won for it acceptance by the Graeco-Roman world, while the former had to be dropped. For, as he is forced to admit, Hellenistic Christianity was soaked in the Old Testament. Werner, on the other hand, finds the key to the whole process in the breakdown of the early expectation of the Lord's return, the end of the age, and the inauguration of the Messianic era. Christianity began, not with a simple message of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, but with an elaborate dogma, derived from late-Jewish apocalyptic. Jesus took over from *Enoch* in particular this whole scheme, modifying it only by identifying himself with *Messias designatus*. Apostolic Christianity received it from him, and revised it in the light of his death and resurrection as the events in which the powers of the age to come were already at work. But a later generation had to reckon with the hard fact that the End did not come, history continued on its course as before.

The decisive factor in the development of Christian dogma was thus the necessity of "de-eschatologizing" the original message. That was the work pre-eminently of the post-apostolic age, and there are instances in which

Werner illuminates his subject by drawing on the apocryphal Gospels and Acts to explain how the Church's accredited thinkers reached their results. But the post-apostolic age is not to be put off to the second century; it begins already in the New Testament, even in the Synoptic Gospels. It has long been widely held that the Fourth Gospel takes cognisance of the need for de-eschatologizing and that the Pastoral Epistles know of the Church as a saving institution; the curious reference in II Peter 1:4 to becoming "partakers of the divine nature" has often been suspect. In other words, the acceptance of post-apostolic books as apostolic and their inclusion in the canon was at once one of the ways in which the Church adjusted itself to the new situation and made further adjustments possible. But the process did not stop there; the Nicene Creed and the Reformation are marks in its advance.

On Werner's view, three tendencies can be detected at work in the post-apostolic period. The situation out of which all three arise is that of the dissolution of the Pauline world-view in particular. What was originally a whole now breaks up into a number of fragments, each of which may be taken up for itself and so acquire a meaning it did not have in the original context. In the first place, there are the heretics, notably the Gnostics and the Arians; these sometimes preserve not a little of the Pauline construction, but they fail in the end either because, as in the case of the Gnostics, they misunderstand its terminology at a crucial point, or, with Arius, they reproduce a form of thought that does not meet the needs of a later time. In the second place, there is the Old Catholic Church with the thinkers who retained a place among the orthodox; in this sphere Pauline ideas were sometimes retained with little understanding, and at times positions he had held were actually branded as heretical. In the third place, the Alexandrians Clement and Origen had the courage to deal freely with traditional material and offered a version of the Christian faith that, though soon judged heretical, is worthy of our respect today.

We may consider first what Werner's approach yields for the development of *the doctrine of redemption.* The New Testament starting-point of this is defined in Schweitzer's terms. That is to say, Jesus expected salvation as a cosmic event, the overthrow of Satan by the mighty power of God, and that in the near future. He himself was cast for a decisive role in connection therewith, and would come again as God's viceregerent. Paul looked back on the Cross and Resurrection as the points at which this saving event had already broken into history, though the consummation was still reserved for the future. Christ "gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us out of this present evil world". He abolished the old order under which we live and introduced us into the new and final order of God himself. In his death he therefore joined issue with and overthrew the cosmic forces, the angels, the law, sin, and death, all the tyrannies that held men in their grip. The death of Christ was his victorious encounter with all these spirit-powers and

the end of their reign. And the Christian participates in this cosmic salvation when in baptism he dies with Christ and rises again, to enter already into the life of the age to come. As Paul puts it more than once, he dies to the flesh. "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit."

In all this, Paul formulates a confidence he holds in face of the speedy end of the world. With the passing of that confidence the magnificent construction fell to pieces. It was not disavowed, but its various aspects became distinct theologumena, to be developed each on its own. As an example of this we may take Paul's message of freedom from the law. As he saw it, Christ by his death has annulled the old order, of which the law was a part. Clearly therefore the law can have no claim on the Gentile, though there is no reason why the born Jew should break with it, since "the time is short" and the Parousia will put an end to it once and for all. No one could think in those terms once the hope of the Parousia had begun to fade. But the problem of the Christian's relation to the law remained. Marcion thought he understood Paul; but he did not, he caricatured him. Yet perhaps he came nearer to the great apostle than did the Church, which helped itself out with such expedients as a distinction between the moral parts of the law that were permanently valid and the ceremonial parts that were for Israel only. Not to mention the suggestion that Christ was himself the angel through whom the law was mediated in the first instance!

Another part of the original conception that came loose from its setting in Paul was the victory of Christ over the angelic powers. Much depended here on the interpretation of I Corinthians 2:6–8 and there is evidence that the early Fathers were not unaware what Paul meant by this. But it was replaced in the main by a fantasy-creation, the *descensus ad inferos*. This took two forms. For some, Christ descended into the underworld between his death and resurrection to preach and administer baptism; for others, especially the writers of popular literature in the second century, he went there to compel Satan to give up the souls he held in bondage. In the first case a problem was being dealt with that had not arisen for Paul, that of how the elect of the pre-Christian ages were to participate in the final salvation wrought by Christ. They could not now be left in Hades till the few years elapsed before the Lord returned, bringing redemption to them. In the second form of the *descensus ad inferos* there is a striking shift in emphasis; the death of Christ becomes as it were the door through which he passed on his way to victory over the spirit-forces, no longer—as for Paul—the weapon with which he overthrew them.

In much the same way, the joyous affirmation that Christ has conquered sin became less and less intelligible with the passage of time; the reality of sin remained in the life even of the believer and had to be reckoned with. It yielded therefore to the death of Christ considered as an atonement for sin. For Paul, to be sure, the atoning efficacy of the Cross extended only to sins committed previously; it was appropriated in baptism, and in the short period that remained before the Parousia, the Christian could be required

to live without sin, at least without any grievous sin. In the new situation the new problem of post-baptismal sin had to be faced. This was dealt with in various ways, by a special offer of a second repentance through a prophet (Hermas), or by the sacrament of penance. But the greatest shift in the teaching of the Church was that which began already with Irenaeus and transferred interest from the Cross to the Incarnation, from the destruction of sin to the divinisation of human nature, leading finally to the express repudiation of the Pauline "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" in favour of the resurrection of the flesh as the central Christian dogma and the supreme Christian hope.

We come now to the application of Werner's principle to the development of *Christology*. Jesus, he would say, regarded himself as destined to emerge from death as the Son of Man and Messiah. In the Primitive Church, he was thought of as an angelic being of the highest order, elect to Messiahship and appearing on earth as a man. He belonged, that is to say, to the divine world but was not to be equated with God. As such, he was consistently addressed as "Lord" and spoken of as "at the right hand of God." The only problem this presented was that of the relation between the angelic glory and the life on earth, nor was this a serious one. For such a being as he possessed the power to transform himself into a man, or God could effect such a change by his miraculous power. The only difference of opinion was as to the point at which this transformation took place. Was it at the resurrection that he passed from the condition in which he was "of the seed of David according to the flesh" to that in which he was "the Son of God with power?" Or was it, as the Christological hymn in Philippians 2 would imply, that he was pre-existent "in the form of God" but came to earth "in the form of a slave?"

The angel-Christology of the Primitive Church was slow in dying, even in the new atmosphere of the post-apostolic period. It lived on vigorously, for example, in the various Gnostic schemes that located Jesus among the emanations and aeons between God and the material world. This of course helped to turn the minds of their opponents in another direction. Again, what was Docetism but a perpetuation of the early Christology on the part of those who no longer understood it? They reduced the human life of Jesus to the mere appearance of a supernatural being, whereas for Paul the supernatural being had entered the world as an actual, not an apparent, man. Again, the Fathers in their exegesis of the Old Testament were concerned to show that the angels who appear in its narratives were after all so many manifestations of the one Christ. Of especial importance in this connection was the LXX of Isaiah 9:6, where the coming deliverer—identified by the Church with Christ—is referred to as "Angel of the great council." But the original Christology was by now so strange as a whole that the Jewish Christians who still clung to it were accused by the Catholic Church of making Jesus "a mere man."

If this is so, the Arian controversy must be seen in a new light. It may be argued that the position of Arius was religiously inadequate, and that Werner would admit. But it is hardly possible to deny that, by the exegetical standards of the time, Arius had the Bible behind him. The pre-existent Wisdom of Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus, and the Wisdom of Solomon was identified by the Church with the Logos and so with the Son. Was he not then a creature, the first-born indeed of the creation, but still a creature? Was not Arianism in every line of the Christological hymn in Philippians 2? Further, the subordination of the Son to the Father is obvious in Paul, and he had been followed in this by the main body of the pre-Nicene Fathers. On the other hand, the partisans of *homoousios* had to admit that this term was unscriptural and an innovation, so that they only accepted it under pressure of controversy. Why then did the *homoousios* prevail? Because in the meantime the Church's soteriology had been radically transformed. For the overthrow of Satan, sin, the law, and death, one who acted with God's authority was sufficient. If, however, man was to be divinised, to be changed from a corruptible to an incorruptible nature, then he must have divine substance.

The term *homoousios* was borrowed from the Gnostics, who were the first to give it theological currency, but the Nicenes gave it a Sabellian twist. It was a fortress into which they withdrew in order to face the two enemies who were advancing at the same time, albeit from different directions. In the same way, the two-natures theory was borrowed from the Gnostics, who had to construct a scheme to show how the heavenly Son could be united with the man Jesus of whom the Gospels told. That some acts were done by his human, others by his divine, nature was their explanation before it was taken over by the Church. But one problem was solved thus only at the price of raising another, that of the unity of the person. The theory of *communicatio idiomatum* was appealed to. But if that were carried far enough to be really useful, the distinction between the natures would disappear again. Apollinarius revived what was once the accepted view, that the Logos united himself at the incarnation with a human body, so making it immortal. But without a human soul, would Christ be truly human? So the Church stumbled on from one position to another, because it had perforce to break with the simple eschatological scheme of the Primitive Church but would not admit it. Instead, it claimed to preserve apostolic tradition, and had therefore to recast that tradition so as to justify what was in fact a grave and inevitable departure from it.

I have dealt so far with two of the major points in the development of dogma. I come now to four instances in which Werner's treatment is much less detailed but no less suggestive. The one that calls for priority of consideration is clearly *escatology* itself. Here again, it is urged, the starting-point was Paul. For him, as in I Corinthians 15:23-28, there were to be two resurrections. The first would take place at the Parousia, when the

departed saints would rise to share with those still alive in the Messianic reign; the second (for the rest of mankind) would take place at the end of that period. In the post-apostolic age the clear distinction between these two resurrections became less and less tenable. Interest was shifted therefore from cosmic to individual eschatology, from the end of the world to the fate of the soul at death. Problems such as those of the intermediate state now emerged. But by far the most serious problem, and one the Church was never able to solve, was that of how to reconcile the general resurrection at the last day with the claim that only participation in the sacraments could secure immortality and the resurrection of the flesh. How could one and the same thing be at once the privilege of the Christian and the common human destiny?

What next of the *Church*? For Paul, this was the community of the last days, the company of the elect who had died and risen again with Christ in baptism, thus being incorporated into his body, and who would share in his reign at the Return. They were therefore drawn exclusively from what Paul thought of as the last generation of mankind before the Parousia. When the generation to which the first disciples belonged had gone to the grave, the whole conception of the Church needed to be considered afresh. It became the body of Christ in a new sense, as the saving institution in which the sacraments were administered that conferred eternal life, the community of the deified. Further, the original expectation that the saints would rule the world underwent an equally drastic change. It re-emerged in two forms, as the claim of the bishop to exercise authority here and now as the delegate of Christ, and as the promise of a peculiar reward for the martyr and the confessor. These were so many adjustments to a new situation in which the Church needed to maintain a continuing life in the world and yet to justify this by an appeal to the New Testament.

One of the most interesting chapters in Werner's book is that in which he deals with the immense influence of *John* 19:32-35 upon the doctrine of the sacraments. He collects a good deal of evidence in favour of his view that in the post-apostolic Church the sacraments were not attached to the New Testament accounts of their institution, but were regarded as arising out of the death of Christ. He is inclined indeed to think that the conception is older than its appearance in the Fourth Gospel. He shows to what a riot of speculation it led in the course of time, how the Cross came to be identified with the tree of life, and how the Old Testament was ransacked for passages, the allegorical interpretation of which would support the doctrine. Thus, the story of Eve's creation from Adam's rib led easily to an interpretation of the Johannine passage that applied it to the creation, not merely of the sacraments, but of the Church from the wounded side of Jesus. Even the repulsive story of Lot and his daughters in Genesis 19 was pressed into service by over-acute exegetes.

All that has been said so far concerns theology. How was the ethic of the New Testament affected when it came to be interpreted and applied in a

generation that no longer lived by the tremendous Pauline conviction that the power of the old world had once for all been broken and that the powers of the new were active in the Christian? Here again Gnosticism pointed the way to the Church. It did so by developing two tendencies. The first was to asceticism and the second to license. Those who followed the first stressed one half of the Pauline position—the Christian is dead to the world and must mortify the flesh because in Christ he has died to it; those who followed the second stressed the other half—that the Christian is free and under the Spirit as his only guide. Where the Church differed from Gnostic asceticism, as in Marcion for example, is that it exalted celibacy while accepting procreation; it taught the purification and not the destruction of the flesh. Where it differed from antinomianism was that it revived the legal conception of the Christian life, even making of the Christian what Paul had said he was not, a man still under the law.

I close with a few comments on Werner's work as a whole. It is clear, of course, that only one who is as conversant with the material as he is can adequately criticise his thesis in its detailed application. The present writer is certainly not so qualified. But there are two questions the general reader will want to ask the specialist when he examines and reports on the book. The first is: Has the conclusion been reached by the simple process of first selecting the evidence that will establish it? The second is: Did the development of Christian dogma really take as logical a form as is here described? In other words, one suspects that the construction is over precise and neat, that what actually happened was something much more desultory and ragged. We can scarcely doubt that Werner has proved that one factor of major importance in the development of Christian dogma was the need to come to terms with the delay of the Parousia, de-eschatologising as he terms it. But one suspects that this is another case in which the discovery of a hitherto neglected factor leads to the fallacy of regarding this as the only one that needs to be considered. A more complex picture might be more convincing.

There is the further doubt as to the starting-point. Werner is wholly convinced by Schweitzer, not only in his *Quest of the Historical Jesus*, but also in his studies of Paul and, in connection with these, of John and the Primitive Church. Here again one may admit that "consistent eschatology" is of great value, while suspecting that it is too consistent and therefore one-sided. The latest study of Schweitzer to which I have access (Henry Babel; *Que pense Albert Schweitzer?*), while championing him, admits that his conclusions need some modification. The mind of Jesus was not dominated by late-Jewish apocalyptic to the extent that Schweitzer supposes; we must allow equal weight to his religious and ethical teaching. Nor is it certain that the texts on which he bases his argument will take as much weight as he places upon them. Further, we must surely allow that Paul was not always self-consistent, that he did not develop a system but threw out a

series of images. I am not convinced that the Johannine theology is as post-apostolic as Werner contends. There seems to be evidence that the Fourth Gospel represents rather a tradition independent of Paul. Here again we must guard against the fallacy of the single explanation.

But, when all this has been said, the great merit of Werner's book has still to be recognised. He has done what so many theologians refuse to do, taken seriously the extent to which the thinking of the Primitive Church was conditioned by the expectation of the Parousia in the near future. It is significant that a writer like G. R. Beasley-Murray, naturally conservative in his approach, finds the evidence leading him irresistibly to the conclusion that Jesus himself anticipated the speedy end of the world and that even the apocalyptic teaching of *Mark* 13 has been denied to him only on *a priori grounds*.[1] It has become the practice for the historical critic to remit the matter to the systematic theologian to deal with and for the latter to evade the issue by alleging that nothing has really happened, we are still living "between the times." Werner has shown that the hope cherished in the Primitive Church was a matter of substance rather than of dating, and that the passing of the hope required that the Christian message be restated. We are heirs to the labour of the centuries, we know now what was at stake as those who took part in it did not know, and we can pass judgment on their work.

Not that our responsibility ceases at that point. We are called to return behind the dogmatic labour of the centuries to the sources of our faith. We shall not, indeed we cannot, reinstate the hope of the Primitive Church in the twentieth century. But as Christians we believe that in Jesus Christ a deed of God was done, a truth of God was disclosed, that are valid for all time. Can we discover this afresh for ourselves? Can we express it in a language that will make it challengingly relevant for our time? If we can, we shall not merely criticise those who went before us, the makers of the dogmas and the creeds; we shall enter into their inheritance. We may reject the *homoousia* as charged with an idea of salvation that is neither that of the New Testament nor our own. But when we seek in the thought of our day for a category that will be adequate to the Gospel, we shall be doing only what the Nicene Fathers did when they accepted the *homoousia*. A later generation will doubtless judge our categories as inadequate as theirs, but if through them we can discharge our responsibility at once to Christ and to the men and women of today, we need not fear the criticism of the future.

1. See his *Jesus and the Future* (London. 1954), pp. 32, 138, and *passim*.

# Book Reviews

## THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

*The Dead Sea Scrolls.* By MILLAR BURROWS. Toronto: Macmillan Company of Canada, 1955. Pp. xv, 435. $7.25.

*The Scrolls from the Dead Sea.* By EDMUND WILSON. Toronto: Oxford, 1955. Pp. vi, 121. $3.50.

*Treasures from Judaean Caves.* By R. B. Y. SCOTT. Toronto: Ryerson, 1955. Pp. ix, 43. $1.25.

THE popular press regards the Dead Sea Scrolls as "news." While coverage has been good, there has been widespread publicity for a number of theories which, to say the least, are doubtful. In *The Dead Sea Scrolls* we now have an authoritative book by a man who has been associated with the discoveries from the very beginning, and who edited three of the most important manuscripts for publication. The book was written "to give a fairly definite idea of what the Dead Sea Scrolls are, why there has been so much excitement over them, and how they are important." The author has succeeded in his avowed purpose of writing "so that he who runs may read."

He tells the story of the first discovery of the scrolls by Bedouin, their negotiations with various people, the preliminary scepticism, and the long tortuous attempts to find a home for the manuscripts. The controversies which arose over jurisdiction, priority of rights, and so forth are traced with scrupulous fairness. Then follows the exciting story of the race to find the caves before the Bedouin had done any more damage. The author carefully, yet dramatically, traces the uncovering of ten caves containing manuscripts in large or small quantities. Evidence piled up that the original scrolls were no forgeries, no remnants from a mediaeval "waste-basket," but a genuine "find" of great antiquity. Early on in the search, a large building was discovered, and over the years it has been excavated to show it as belonging to a Jewish sect. In addition to the ordinary requirements of living (kitchens, refectory, lavatories, water supply) there seems to have been a large "scriptorium" where books were written or copied.

Burrows carries the story of exploration to March, 1955. Since then, de Vaux has published a brief report of the excavations of that spring.[1] One curious find was a series of carefully buried bones of domestic animals, which de Vaux suspects of being the remains of sacred meals. Another expedition has been in the field this spring (1956) but the reviewer has not yet seen a report.

It has been proved beyond doubt that the Manuscripts range in date

1. *Revue Biblique,* January, 1956, pp. 73 ff.

from at least 300 B.C. to about 70 A.D.[2] Almost all of them were deposited while the caves were in use during part of that period. There are only a few die-hard proponents of a mediaeval date. The heat which was generated at times can be felt in the title of one article, *The Antiquity of the Hebrew Scrolls and the Piltdown Hoax: A Parallel.*[3]

The date of deposit can be settled fairly simply, but the date of composition of the texts is much more complex. Burrows gives a lucid account of the internal evidence, and of the various theories put forward to explain it. Even the wildest hypotheses are examined for possible merit. The search for the truth becomes an exciting detective story, of which only the conclusion can be given here:

> . . . It now seems to be fairly well established that the non biblical writings in the scrolls and fragments from the Wady Qumran were all composed within a period of about 135 years, from the accession of Antiochus Epiphanes in 175 B.C., or shortly before that, down to about 40 B.C. [p. 223].

Part four of the book discusses the origin, history, organization of the sect, and surveys the evidence for identification. Evidence of all types shows that a fairly large community of sectarian Jews had withdrawn to the Dead Sea area and were well established there by 130 B.C. They deserted the region, apparently, about the time of an earthquake in 31 B.C. A new start was made after the turn of the era, but the Romans seem to have driven out the community about 68 A.D.[4]

The great number of Biblical books copied and recopied shows that the sect held the Scriptures in great reverence. At least a portion of every Biblical book except Esther has been found.[5] Fragments of many apocryphal and pseudepigraphal books show that they did not confine themselves to the canonical scripture. It is from their own writings, however, that we must understand the sect most clearly. *The Manual of Discipline* is a compendium of rules for the community. A Commentary on Habakkuk interprets the biblical text in terms of the esoteric doctrines. A curious discovery has recently been announced. One of the first four rolls seen by Burrows has only recently been opened, after eight years of bargaining and scientific care. From a strip broken off the back it had been tentatively identified as a lost *Apocalypse of Lamech*. The text has not been published, but it appears to be a commentary on Genesis, and the fragment contained the name of Lamech![6] A series of Thanksgiving Psalms not only continues

2. In some of the caves were found letters dealing with the Bar Kokhba revolt of 132–135 A.D. They are still the subject of some controversy, but are shedding new light on this period of Jewish history.

3. S. Zeitlin, in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1955, pp. 1–29.

4. There were settlements of sorts in the caves at different times from the prehistoric period, and again after 68 A.D., but these need not be discussed here.

5. See further *Le trail d'édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumran*, in *Revue Biblique*, January 1956, pp. 49–67. It may be noted here that *The Biblical Archaeologist*, a quarterly published by the American Schools of Oriental Research, frequently publishes up-to-date news of the Scrolls for the general public.

6. The copper scrolls mentioned on p. 60 have also been opened by a most ingenious process, but the text has not as yet been made public.

the tradition of Hebrew Psalmody, but adds to our knowledge of this branch of Judaism. The following quotations summarize Burrows' discussion of the sect:

In general it may be said that the moral ideals of the covenanters of Qumran are much like those of similar monastic groups in other religions, but quite unlike those of orthodox Judaism at many points. They are the ideals of a group that has withdrawn from the world into a separate life of rigid discipline and purity, going into the desert to prepare the way of the Lord by the study of the law. [p. 245].

Be that as it may, the covenanters firmly believed that they were God's elect, not only as members of the chosen people but also individually as sons of light, the men of God's lot. They had entered the covenant and were members of the community that believed in the teacher of righteousness as the inspired interpreter of the divine mysteries. They looked for a prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel. They confidently expected the judgment and eternal punishment of the sons of darkness, when the dominion of Belial would be brought to an end. They fervently hoped to be cleansed of all evil by the spirit of truth and to enjoy eternal felicity in the presence of God with the angelic hosts. [p 272].

After discussing the identification of the group, he concludes:

To sum up the net result of all the efforts to identify the covenanters, we must first of all insist that any identification must observe the chronological limits set by the established age of the documents. The sect of the teacher of righteousness and his followers was clearly one of the groups formed within Judaism during the pre-Maccabean and Hasmonean periods. It may probably be accurately included under the term Hasidim, but that does not indicate a specific sect. In many ways it was akin to the Essenes, as we know them from sources of the Roman period. If this term is used in a broad, comprehensive sense, we may legitimately call the Qumran sectarians Essenes. For the present, however, in order not to prejudge the case, it seems better to reserve that name for the group described by Philo and Josephus, which if their reports are accurate, was not exactly identical or coextensive with the Qumran community. As a matter of convenience we may still designate the latter by the term "covenanters," which implies neither the acceptance nor the rejection of their identification with the Essenes. At any rate, it is clear that the sect of Qumran was more closely related to the Essenes than to any other group known to us [p. 298].

The fifth part of the book deals with the importance of the scrolls. It is difficult to express the unexpectedness and the extent of the new Biblical manuscripts. In 1939 one of the great textual critics could write, "There is . . . no probability that we shall ever find manuscripts of the Hebrew text going back to a period before the formation of the text which we know as Massoretic."[7] The Dead Sea copies of Biblical texts are older than Kenyon's date for the Massoretic text by as much as four centuries. All of them are older by nearly a millenium than any previously known copy of the Hebrew Bible. Many of the new finds show that the Massoretic text is

7. F. Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, fourth edition (London, 1939), p. 48.

older than was believed. Others show significant variation from the received text. Burrows gives a number of examples to illustrate these points to the readers who do not know Hebrew. It will, of course, take years of careful, detailed study, word by word, before the potential value of the Dead Sea Scrolls is realized in this field. It will be a job for experts, since not all Hebraists are competent textual critics.

Specialists are also working in other areas, only some of which can be mentioned here. Grammatical studies in Hebrew have been greatly assisted by the mass of new documents. The very fact that most are in Hebrew, not Aramaic, is surprising, and calls for further study. Aramaic texts have been found in some numbers, and have supplied welcome additions to what was formerly a scanty selection of inscriptions in the dialect spoken in Jesus' time.

From these more technical matters the author turns to the doctrinal and historical importance of the discoveries. He deals with the supposed and real parallels between the teachings of the sect and Christian thought. He rejects the alleged connection between John the Baptist and Jesus on the one hand with the Essenes on the other. He finds more resemblance between the early Church and the teaching of the Covenanters, especially in organization, worship, rites, ideals and conduct. He adds, however,

> Even the scholars who have looked most eagerly for parallels between the early Christians and the covenanters have recognized that there are equally notable differences. The church was not an exclusive, esoteric group with jealously guarded secret teachings. The gospel given to it had to be proclaimed to all the world [p. 333].

He does not feel that after seven years' study of the scrolls, his own understanding of the New Testament has been substantially affected. He may be overcautious at this point, but at the present stage of research such caution is needed. Some modification may be necessary as time goes on, and the author himself suggests areas that must be explored.

> But why expect too much? Is it not enough that we can interpret the New Testament with more assurance of perfect understanding because we know better the intellectual and spiritual setting in which it was written? And, knowing more fully the world into which the Gospel came, its deep devotion and high hopes as well as its pathetic aberrations, we can the better realize what the Gospel brought to that world. Perhaps the best thing the Dead Sea Scrolls can do for us is to make us appreciate our Bible all the more by contrast [p. 343].

The reader who is concerned, but does not read Hebrew, is in some measure enabled to "judge for himself." Part six of the book contains translations of the *Damascus Document*, the *Habakkuk Commentary*, and the *Manual of Discipline*, together with selections from the *War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness*, and the *Thanksgiving Psalms* (*Hodayoth*). While some of the ideas of the sect seem strange, even repulsive, to us, no one can deny the zeal and fervour of the writers. The spirituality of some passages in the psalms makes them worth more than a passing glance.

The volume ends with 16 pages of bibliography—a mere fraction of what has been written on the subject since 1948! At the beginning of the book there are nine carefully selected photographs, well reproduced, together with two maps. The reviewer regrets the absence of footnotes, and of an index, but realizes that these academic tools were omitted to keep down costs.

The excellence of Burrows' book is far greater than that of Wilson's. *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea* is a revision of an article which appeared in *The New Yorker*, and has much to commend it. There is a very readable account of the finding of the scrolls, and of the exploration of the caves. Then follows a brief sketch of the history and doctrines of the Essenes, who are identified with the Qumran sect. A chapter is devoted to the "Teacher of Righteousness," and another to the significance of the finds. There are many thumb-nail sketches of the personalities first concerned with the scrolls, and of people who subsequently worked on them. Local colour is added when the author describes such things as his visit to the caves, and to the Metropolitan Samuel. The controversies over the scrolls are described with vigour.

The author's reputation as a writer, the excellence of the style, and the popularity of the subject have combined to give the book a place on the best-seller lists. This is gratifying insofar as the public is being informed of one of the most significant finds in many years. Unfortunately, the book is marred by a cavalier treatment of controversial matters, and by an apparently sweeping condemnation of most scholars. Wilson admits that he is not competent to pass judgment on many of the scholarly treatises which have been written on the subject, but maintains that most scholars, Jewish, Christian, and humanist, have been so bound by their pre-conceived ideas that they have not dared accept the full implications of the new discoveries. A few unbiased minds, notably Dupont-Sommer, have seen the truth.

The sectarian literature, as Wilson interprets his authorities, is proof that Christianity is largely an outgrowth of the Essenes. Jesus merely refined some of the ideas held by that sect. One is left with the feeling that Christianity has at last been "cut down to size." All this overlooks the fact that comparison between Judaism and Christianity has been going on for centuries. Only since 1948 have we had the documents of unofficial Judaism in such quantities as to make comparison possible. Nor is Dupont-Sommer prepared to go quite as far as Wilson takes him. The former's real purpose is expressed in the following quotation:

> My idea was that instead of looking for the Jewish substratum of Christian doctrine in Pharisaism and Talmudic quarters, as had hitherto been done, henceforth the same research must be conducted from the direction of Essenism as revealed in the new documents.[8]

As noted above, Burrows and others are not prepared to accept this position

8. A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes*, trans. by R. D. Barnett (London, 1954), p. 152.

entirely, but all would agree that parallels between the sect and Christianity must be explored.

Wilson complains (p. 101) that only Dupont-Sommer made complete information available to the public. Apart from some press-releases, everything else was buried in technical journals and monographs. Naturally, until the situation was clear enough to warrant popular treatises! He seems to find almost sinister implications in the fact that New Testament scholars "have almost without exception boycotted the whole subject of the scrolls" (p. 99). What would he expect? Although many of them are competent Hebraists, the New Testament people waited until their Old Testament colleagues, who were first in the field, had made texts and translations available. All Biblical scholars, historians, and theologians are interested, even excited, about the finds, but the fact that they have not rushed into print is more a virtue than a vice.

Nor does Wilson interpret the scepticism of some scholars correctly. At the outset it was quite proper to raise the question of forgery, or mistaken dating. The scrolls contain so many previously unknown features that it was easy to make a case for a later date than was subsequently established.

Because of these very serious weaknesses in the work, this reviewer feels that Wilson's work has been vitiated. For a short treatment of the scrolls, he would recommend R. B. Y. Scott's little book. This is a revision of talks given over the National Network of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in August 1955, shortly after the author had purchased a great number of manuscript fragments for McGill University. The book gives an outline of the discoveries, of the sect and its identification with the Essenes, a description of the manuscripts, together with an examination of their authenticity and date. He concludes with an estimate of the significance of the scrolls. There are four photographs, three of them rather small.

All three books noticed here were written for the general public. Wilson's is the most ephemeral, and the most one-sided. Scott's work is designedly a summary, but needs no apology. Burrows' is a definitive treatment of the state of affairs at the time of publication. It is so carefully written that it will probably be useful for a long time to come.

T. A. M. Barnett

Wycliffe College
Toronto

*Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition.* By Derrick Sherwin Bailey, Ph.D. New York: Longmans, Green, 1955. Pp. xii, 181.

"The sin of Sodom was unnatural vice," says Dr. Simpson commenting upon Genesis 19 in *The Interpreter's Bible*; in this he states the usual tradition as both Driver and Skinner had done before him. When the men of Sodom, it is argued, demanded Lot's guests that "they might know

them," they meant "carnal knowledge." About a third of Bailey's book is devoted to calling in question the correctness of this exegesis. While there are several references to the Sodomites as very wicked, there is no evidence of a "homosexual" interpretation of their wickedness until the period of the hellenized Judaism of the second century B.C. Bailey has evidently given the Old Testament specialists something to think about; but it seems an oddly obscure point over which to spill so much ink, and a reader unfamiliar with the tradition of Christian moral theology might be left with the impression that the Church settles important moral questions by reference to a fundamentalist understanding of ancient legends. The writer certainly knows better; however he has deliberately in this book limited himself in such a way as to ignore other views.

The best part of the book deals with the history of the civil, penitential and canonical legislation regarding homosexual acts. The author has performed a really useful service in helping the reader unfamiliar with these matters to distinguish between these types of enactment and to understand especially the Church's approach to the problem through penance and canon law. This approach has been persistently misunderstood by writers like Havelock Ellis and Westermarck and by the growing number of writers who repeat their animadversions without understanding the evidence, or in some instances without evidence at all. Legal cognizance of homosexual acts among adult males ante-dates the Christian era and there were penalties. The Christian emperors introduced into the legislation a motive derived from the Sodom legend, and recommended that the way be kept open for repentance. As a *novella* of 544 put it: God "has acted mercifully towards us and, awaiting our penitence, has reserved his wrath for other times—for he has 'no pleasure in the death of the wicked. . . .'" Some modern legislators could learn from this.

The Irish Penitentials, so grievously misunderstood by writers like G. Rattray Taylor, take a step forward in dealing with sins of the flesh. Bailey's treatment of this literature, while sound, could have been improved by a consideration of the introduction to the penitentials by McNeill and Gamer in their *Medieval Handbooks of Penance*. In the penitentials there is a serious effort to classify offences more widely, to consider the sinner rather than the sin, and to place the reconstruction of personality ahead of the application of stereotyped penances. All this is very rudimentary; but understood against the contemporary background, it was a genuinely Christian contribution to an understanding of the problem.

A tendency to suspect the worst in sexual offences is very widespread. Incautious writers seize upon the excessive denunciations of Peter Damian and fail to observe that the pope himself took a more calm view of the homosexual offender and pronounced dangerous the position of those who, like Damian, took so intemperate a view of these failings. Wild exaggeration characterizes much of what is said by those who denounce the homosexual, and by those who denounce the Church's historic attitude to the homo-

sexual: it characterizes also *some* exegesis. (In *The Interpreter's Bible*, in the expository part, after references to sodomy and to the unhappy end of Lot's wife, it is said that she "was not only accustomed to Sodom; apparently she liked it and did not want to leave. . . . Lot's wife held her hot desires too close to Sodom, and the result was disastrous." This appears to be the discovery of still another vice certainly not mentioned in the text. Dr. Simpson, in the exegesis, remarks more coolly, "The verse explains a curiously shaped salt formation in the terrain.") For this whole tendency to invent or suspect the worst, Dr. Bailey's essay is a good detergent.

The principal failing of this book, and in this reviewer's mind it is a serious one, is Dr. Bailey's constant isolation of "inversion as a *condition* due to biological, or psychological, or genetical causes." This view lacks general support among researchers. It is an attractive rationalization both to the unsuccessful therapist and to the self-satisfied invert. It is an unsafe foundation from which to elaborate a moral theology; if seriously held in some quarters it would put an end to much useful research looking to the encouragement of sex variants to achieve adult modes of behaviour (in accord, incidentally, with the Christian view of the natural law).

CHARLES FEILDING

Trinity College
Toronto

*The Medieval Manichee.* By STEVEN RUNCIMAN. Cambridge University Press (Macmillan Company of Canada), 1955. Pp. x, 212. $3.50.

THE reprinting of this book is a notable service to all students of history and of religion in general. Thanks to his linguistic ability, Runciman's researches into medieval manichaeism rest solidly, not only on the sources, but also upon those many investigations of Byzantine, Russian and Balkan history which, unhappily, are not written in a modern European language. We should therefore be deeply grateful for the material presented here in English by Runciman's painstaking scholarship.

His subject is that dualist religion which has appeared as a kind of undergrowth within the Christian tradition since the second century. At the base of dualism lies the desire to solve the problem of evil by attributing the visible creation to the work of a second-rate deity (Marcion), or to Satan (Mani), or to a cosmic disaster within the divine realm (Valentinus and others). From this fundamental error, there developed a religion which, for all its Christian trappings, despised the Creator and His creation, which substituted for a Christian providence, the horrors of fatalism and demonology, and which understood man to be an impersonal spirit imprisoned by hostile forces in evil matter. Dualism's saviour was not the Christ of the Gospel but rather a Christ shorn of His suffering humanity and therefore of His redemption of man as man by His Cross and Resurrection. Rejecting

the Church and its sacraments, especially marriage, dualism taught an unnatural austerity as a way of escape from the entanglements of matter wherein Spirit would be re-absorbed by Spirit and matter left to return to its origins of darkness and hell.

To describe the history of this religious tradition, Runciman has constructed this essay in the history of ideas. Taking its origin from Gnosticism, passing through Mani, influenced slightly by various Christian heresies, dualism was preserved by the Messalians who lived, first, in Armenia, and then in Thrace, everywhere execrated for their depraved morals and their bizarre demonology. More dangerous were the dualist Paulicians, who, although driven from their home in Armenia, continued to wreak havoc, raiding and pillaging the farms and towns of the orthodox Christians of Asia Minor. Crushed by Basil the Macedonian, Paulician refugees were settled in Bulgaria where their teachings were adopted and elaborated by a teacher of genius, Bogomil. Yet in spite of persecution and repression by the orthodox emperors of Constantinople in the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries, dualism flowed on, like an underground river, appearing next in Bosnia as the religion of the Patarenes. Here dualism obtained the allegiance of nobility and peasants alike, and despite all efforts, Bosnia remained, in the bitter words of Urban V, the "cesspool for all the heresies of the world." It is one of the chief merits of Runciman's book that it presses home the fact that dualism flourished on social misery, as in Armenia, gained strength from corruption in church and state, as in Bulgaria, and drew much of its vitality from nationalism and racialism wherever it went, as in Bosnia and elsewhere.

However, dualism's greatest triumph came in the conquest of southern France in the twelfth century. There the baronage and peasants, hating the Church for its power as well as for its moral shortcomings, openly espoused the infection which had reached them from Bosnia via Italy. The eloquence of Bernard, the strength of the southern French episcopate, repeated papal excommunications and even the heroic purity and evangelical zeal of the Dominicans proved inadequate to check its growth. Finally the Papacy summoned the northern French baronage and the Inquisition to extirpate the pest. Untold thousands, Cathars or Albigensians as we commonly describe them, perished in the holocaust. Many have cherished feelings of righteous indigation over the cruel treatment meted out to the Albigensians at the behest of the Triple Tyrant. It is to be hoped that such will re-examine their opinions in the light of Runciman's straightforward account of Albigensian faith and practise, a creed which had its origins in the diseased religious imagination of the ancient world of the East.

This excellent monograph is not without its blemishes. It is a pity to read once again that Augustine never entirely rid himself of manichaean doctrine. Greater surprise occurs when we are told that St. Francis' sympathy for all living things was learned from the Cathars. A more serious question might be raised concerning the importance placed by Runciman on the role

of the Marcionite church organization in preserving the dualist tradition. Above all, Runciman too often seems to think of dualism as a Christian heresy and not as a distinctive interpretation of the universe and human destiny which invested Christian symbols with a content alien and indeed hostile to Christian revelation.

In discussing the failure of dualism, Runciman manifests considerable theological acumen. It was indeed a religion founded upon despair and which possessed no living hope. One might go farther and suggest that the religion arose from the self-hatred present in every human soul. From that self-hatred came despair over the human condition, scorn for the flesh and the sacramental and a false spirituality which blasphemously attempted to transcend the limits imposed on man by his Creator.

JOHN GORDON ROWE

Huron College
University of Western Ontario

*Reinhold Niebuhr: His Religious, Social and Political Thought.* Edited by CHARLES W. KEGLEY and ROBERT W. BRETALL. (The Library of Living Theology, Vol. II.) New York: Macmillan (Toronto: Brett-Macmillan), 1956. Pp. ix, 486. $6.50.

HERE is the second volume in The Library of Living Theology. The work contains an intellectual autobiography of Reinhold Niebuhr; twenty essays on some aspects of Niebuhr's thought by twenty scholars of different schools; Niebuhr's reply to their interpretation and criticisms; a bibliography of the writings of Reinhold Niebuhr to 1956; and subject and name indices.

In his intellectual autobiography Niebuhr traces the development of his thought from its formulative period which included an exposure to the thought of Harnack under the guidance of his father and attendance at the college and seminary of his denomination. Family needs and boredom with epistemology were the reasons which prompted him to forswear graduate study and an academic career. He accepted a parish in Detroit. His experiences in parish work fostered and developed his latent talent. Reared in the idealistic tradition, confronted with modern scientism which covered the field of political analysis with sentimentality and confusion; sceptical of the validity of the Social Gospel to do justice to personality, freedom, sin and history, Niebuhr turned to an existential analysis of the human situation and destiny. From that point on his numerous writings bear testimony to the challenge and thoroughness of that analysis.

The interpretation and criticism of Niebuhr's thought and work opens with some remarks by Emil Brunner. As one might expect, Brunner takes Niebuhr to task on the question of "natural law." He thinks that Niebuhr's ethics suffer on account of the lack of an adequate concept of justice and that he is deficient between criticism and construction which gives rise to

the lack of concrete ethical postulates for social action. It is a pity that a personal note intrudes when Brunner complains that Niebuhr failed to acknowledge his debt to him in his Gifford Lectures. Brunner is afraid that a lack of acknowledgement of Continental writers, at a time of American supremacy as a world power, leads to the danger of a false view of theological development.

Paul Tillich writes an intelligible criticism of "Niebuhr's Doctrine of Knowledge," although the difficulty about Niebuhr's epistemology lies in the fact that he has none. It can, however, be made to appear from an analysis of his doctrine of reason. Tillich, like other contributors in this symposium, thinks that Niebuhr confuses classical with modern understandings of reason. He also, naturally enough, fails to see how Niebuhr can dodge the ontological question by merely speaking of "self." He thinks that Niebuhr is at fault in giving preference to Jewish over Greek encounters with reality.

Other contributors, whom Niebuhr describes as "Friendly Critics," i.e. those who are in general agreement with him but who criticize some peripheral point, include J. C. Bennett, Paul Lehmann, Kenneth Thompson, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Alan Richardson, Karl Löwith, Richard Kroner, R. E. Fitch and Paul Scherer. Bennett, Thompson and Schlesinger trace Niebuhr's political and social pilgrimage and let the record damn him. Richardson disagrees with Niebuhr on one point only, i.e. miracles. Richardson suspects that Niebuhr holds a similar position to that of Bultmann although Niebuhr denies this. Kroner criticizes Niebuhr's account of the Church; Lehmann certain aspects of his Christology, while Fitch raises the 'bogy' of 'natural law' again and thinks that Niebuhr is unduly critical. Niebuhr defends himself against this latter charge on the ground of polemic which, perhaps, gives point to his reply to Kroner's criticism, i.e. Kroner is wrong to think that he was first influenced by the Reformers rather than by St. Augustine.

Any symposium about Reinhold Niebuhr would be totally lacking if there were not some word about Niebuhr as a preacher. Paul Scherer very ably fills the gap. To all those who, like the reviewer of this work, had the privilege of hearing Niebuhr preach on numerous occasions Scherer's words must express our sentiments. "It was an exhilerating experience for both young and old to hear him 'pour it on' of a Sunday morning, looking like a hawk and swooping upon his prey, hawk fashion, to the accompaniment of wing-like gestures and torrential sentences. Here was something new and different in the pulpit . . . complete vitality of mind and body. . . . I feel as if I had been caught in an air raid" (pp. 320–321).

Amongst the group of Niebuhr's substantive critics are to be included Daniel D. Williams, Edward J. Carnell, Gustave Weigel, S.J., Henry N. Wieman, E. A. Burtt, A. J. Burnstein and A. I. Heschel.

Daniel D. Williams describes Niebuhr as the foremost critic of liberal Christianity. He is of the opinion that Niebuhr's theology has been largely

worked out on the basis of his criticisms of liberal presuppositions. In view of this, Williams thinks that it is possible to get at the meaning of Niebuhr's theology by an examination of his relationship to liberalism. Niebuhr has raised the crucial difficulty in liberal theology, i.e. the question whether the course of history exhibits any such progressive movement towards redemption as the liberal theologians held. Niebuhr takes Williams to task for imputing to him a doctrine of a sharp distinction between mutual love and sacrificial love and affirms that the relation contains that between the historical and eschatological.

E. J. Carnell thinks that his criticism of Niebuhr is substantive while Niebuhr thinks that it is not. Carnell agrees with Niebuhr that Christian faith is verified by experience of redemption, but thinks that Niebuhr puts forward a view that is too subjective. He wants to know upon what basis one can maintain the absoluteness of Christian faith while recognizing the relativity of any formulation of the meaning of faith? Niebuhr's reply is not convincing. Father Weigel appears to put forward an *argumentum ad verecundiam* in his criticism and Niebuhr's reply is very well taken. Weigel, in effect, suggests that one must choose between Niebuhr and a great historic institution. Niebuhr very cleverly suggests that Weigel has made a 'palpable hit' that may leave the 'private critic' reeling.

H. N. Wieman is the most substantive critic of Niebuhr. The religious naturalist takes an opposed view to *any* interpretation of classical faith. E. A. Burtt's questions are very well put. He wants to know how Niebuhr can speak of a Biblical view of God, man and sin when there is more than one view to be found in the Bible? Niebuhr's answer is not convincing to this, and neither is his answer to Burtt's second point, i.e. that Niebuhr assumes that religious experience only takes place in a specifically Christian framework. Rabbi Burnstein suggests that Niebuhr's interpretation of human justice is at variance with normative Judaism, but in Niebuhr's opinion Dr. Heschel refutes Burnstein's argument.

This is a book that one can pick up and put down according to one's interests at the moment. On the whole it should appeal to all since all theological viewpoints are pressed in one way or another, either in approval of Niebuhr or at his expense.

CHARLES C. LANDON

St. John's College
Winnipeg

*Sect, Cult and Church in Alberta.* By WILLIAM E. MANN. University of Toronto Press, 1955. Pp. xiii, 166. $4.00.

THIS book is one of a series sponsored by the Canadian Social Science Research Council relating to the background and development of the Social Credit Movement in Alberta. It calls attention as Professor S. D. Clark emphasizes in a foreword "to an aspect of development of the western

Canadian community which has been peculiarly neglected"; it also calls attention to the failures and shortcomings of the more established churches in this same area and ought to be salutary reading for those who have the serious responsibility of directing the religious institutions of Canada; furthermore it fits into a succession of studies on Canadian religious development from a sociological point of view.

It is interesting to observe that it is the sociologists who have in recent years shown the most lively interest in Canadian Church history. The nearest approach by a Canadian writer to an integrated Church history of Canada is S. D. Clark's *Church and Sect in Canada*, which was hailed by Professor J. B. Brebner as "a monumental milestone in Canadian historical writing" accompanied by a warning that "particularist studies will seem inexcusable except insofar as they fill in gaps in our knowledge and are adequately related to the edifice which Mr. Clark has erected."

The book under review is written by one of Professor Clark's students and is a necessary complement to Dr. Clark's own work, since it is more particularly concerned with religious movements which have grown up in Alberta since 1900, the terminus of *Church and Sect in Canada*. Being a trained theologian Dr. Mann indulges a little more in religious terms than did his teacher, but he also displays the same "cool theological detachment." In view of the neglect of historians to cultivate the field of Canadian Church history we must be grateful that the sociologists are filling in the void and are also impressing upon us the significance of religious movements in the social development of Canada, but one does become rather chilled with the cool detachment with which they write their stories. This is probably inevitable within the terms of reference of a sociological project, but there does seem to be missing, particularly in the field of religion, any perception of a vision of man trying to express himself above the level of nature; also one feels the lack of any serious attempt to winnow truth from falsehood.

Be that as it may, Dr. Mann helps us to become acquainted fairly intimately with about fifty distinct religious bodies exclusive of the traditional Churches in the province of Alberta; he draws for us a useful distinction between sect and cult—the former pre-scientific and the latter post-scientific; he tells something of their liturgy and doctrine; their programmes and organizations. Two of the most interesting chapters in the book are on the rôle of leadership and the techniques of evangelization, which afford real insight into the strength and adaptability of the sects in a changing social situation. Dr. Mann particularly emphasizes the importance of the Bible College, now a prominent feature in the cultural development of Western Canada. In some respects these colleges or institutes resemble the folk-high schools of Denmark, as they enroll youth after they have had some experience in the work-a-day world and endeavour to inculcate a definite philosophy of life. Consequently they are producing a great many lay leaders who are not only able to assist in the expansion of their respective sects, but also become active in the political world as well. At his Bible school in Calgary

Premier Aberhart was able to train politicians, some of whom became members of his cabinet, and one of them, E. C. Manning, assumed the mantle of leadership after the death of his leader in 1943.

The concluding chapter of Dr. Mann's book is somewhat of a disappointment; as the author fails to draw firm conclusions from the disturbing facts that he has collected about Western Canada and particularly the province of Alberta.

What are we to say of this sectarian revolt against the conventional Churches and which has now taken over the political direction of two provinces of Canada? It is surely disconcerting to realize that all these sects, from the Mormons to the Pentecostals, are Biblical literalists, emotional reactionaries, suggestible to strange revelations, anti-many things, including the Roman Catholic Church and the Jewish Homeland, hostile to scientific learning and easily manipulated by unscrupulous demagogues. It is true that one must respect the sincerity of many of these sects, and concede a spiritual value in their services and recognize their religion as naturally that of "the naive and simple heart that craves touch with the supernatural"; yet one must be concerned when this naivety moves into centres of power without divesting itself of its highly emotional aspects. These are some of the observations that one expected to find in the concluding chapters of the book, as they are implicit in the factual descriptions that Dr. Mann has given us of the sects. But it is probably asking too much to expect prophetic warnings from trained sociologists. Meanwhile we have to be content with the author's own observation that there "exist trouble spots only yet slightly explored," and agree with him that "This study has done nothing more than offer a hint of the nature and extent of such trouble spots. It does, however, it is hoped, point the way to further fruitful investigations which may be undertaken in this area."

H. H. WALSH

McGill University
Montreal

*The Virgin Mary: the Roman Catholic Marian Doctrine.* By GIOVANNI MIEGGE, translated by WALDO SMITH. London: Lutterworth Press (Toronto: Ryerson Press), 1955. Pp. 196. $4.25.

THE author, who is Professor of Church History on the Waldensian Faculty of Theology in Rome, has set himself the important but exacting task of explaining to Protestants the origin and development of Marian doctrine and devotion in the Roman Catholic Church. His aim is not primarily controversial; "rather it is to discuss among Christians a problem that however grave should not be insoluble, and, for a solution, must be treated with respect." The problem is, of course, the widening gulf between Christians of which the profound difference in teaching and worship connected with the cultus of the Virgin Mary is one of the most striking signs.

On the one hand, there is the basic Protestant objection as voiced by Zwingli: "We do not dishonour the Mother of God, the Virgin Mary, because we do not allow her to be worshipped in the same way as God: for if we tried to attribute to her the dignity and power of the Creator, she herself would not allow such worship . . . The more highly the Mother of God, the Virgin, is exalted above all other creatures and the more reverently she is devoted to God, her Son, the less will she accept that worship which is due to God alone." It might be suggested that a good deal of Protestant piety, agreeing heartily with the objection, might be startled or shocked by the traditionally orthodox language in which it is expressed.

On the other hand, there is the rich, even luxuriant development of Marian devotion in the Roman Church, particularly during the last century: "the proper theme of the mariology of the twentieth century is co-redemption; that is, Mary's active collaboration with Christ in the redemption of the world." If at times Protestant piety might seem to lag behind the traditional statements, Roman Catholic devotion would appear to anticipate definition, even to compel it. In discussing the development from the late stories of Mary's Assumption in the early Church to the full-blown dogmatic statement of 1950, Professor Miegge observes: "Our apocrypha are the expression of these pious beliefs which inspire sacred oratory in the festivals dedicated to Mary and the liturgical hymns composed in her honour. And in due course they enter also into learned meditation along the accustomed line of development: first the popular piety, then the worship, and finally the theology that reflects and justifies the worship."

The author's method of treatment is historical; that is, he begins with the figure of Mary as it appears in the Gospel, proceeds to discuss the title Theotokos in the setting of the controversies concerning the Person of Christ in the Fifth Century, and then traces the further growth of Marian devotion and its theological rationale in the Latin Church of the West to the present day. He takes careful note of influences from outside Christianity, but wisely refuses to exaggerate their importance. "Whatever be the precedents and analogies offered by the history of religions, the cult of Mary is a phenomenon endowed with its own individuality; and this deserves observation in itself."

One of the most interesting, and certainly the most provocative, of the author's arguments is that which links the recent rapid development of Mariological doctrine to the same trend of thought which was so sharply censured at the beginning of this century under the name of "Modernism." "The way of the progressive humanizing of Christianity, followed at first unconsciously, then, and especially in modern mariology, with clear awareness, is not without resonance in the contemporary religious consciousness. It can be interpreted as a parallel within Catholicism of the general tendency to the laicizing of faith, followed consciously in other fields by the protagonists of positivism. The religion of humanity, in its liberal or Marxist expressions, is, more than it seems, spiritually related to the impulse that excites Catholicism to promote the purely human figure of Mary to the first

plane of popular devotion. Certainly it is to this that it owes its popular favour, and perhaps the consciousness of its promoters of being in the current of living history, of answering to a sort of unconscious invocation of our time and hence the illusion of being able by this way to recover a part of lost spiritual authority to the end of promoting a Christian reawakening."

There are some statements which will not pass without query from the theologians. Not everyone would agree that "through Augustine a notable infusion of Manichaeism had penetrated into the very body of Catholic Christianity." One may wonder what the author has in mind when he asserts: "Some centuries later the Reformation was to separate sex from sin, in the conception of original sin, abandoning the crypto-Manichaeism, which from Augustine afflicted the nuptials of Christianity, confirming again at the same time the tragic sense of life which was its profound and human value." And is it not begging the question, at least, to call Duns Scotus "the great nominalist doctor"?

W. Lyndon Smith

Trinity College
Toronto